

THE RÔLE OF THE ARAB TRIBES IN THE  
EAST DURING THE PERIOD OF THE  
UMAYYAD<sup>S</sup>(40/660 - 132/749)

by

Nājī Hasan Hādī

Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of  
Philosophy in the University of Edinburgh.

June 1973



# ABSTRACT

It has for long been recognized that the strength and the weakness of the Umayyad Empire arose from its Arab character; and, while the conquests of the armies of Islām expanded the frontiers with spectacular speed, the elements composing these armies still nurtured the rivalries and antagonisms brought with them from the Arabian Peninsula. Before Islām, this tribalism had never been able to manifest itself in a political rôle, and, indeed, many of the bases on which it was presumed to rest can be shown to be fictitious; however, once given an opportunity for political expression, it neutralized all the other organs of government and, in effect, imported the attitudes of the desert into the regions of Middle Eastern civilization.

The present study examines the origins of these tribes, and the distribution of their various groups, throughout the region. The tribes included in the first expansion are identified, and their earliest settlements in the conquered territories are described. Particular attention has been paid to their position in 'Irāq and Khurāsān, for here we find that regional influences as much as tribal sentiments were operative as political forces. While to the Umayyad Caliph in Damascus political expediency demanded an identification



with one or another of the two main tribal groupings, 'Irāq and Khurāsān are shown to be developing regional personalities in despite of an incessant preoccupation with such tribal antipathies and rivalries. In dwelling upon this facet of Umayyad history, both the realities and the fictions of Arab tribalism are exposed, along with the contribution it made to the final debacle.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I should like to express my deepest  
gratitude to my supervisors  
Professor W. Montgomery Watt and Mr. J.R. Walsh.

I am also greatly indebted to my family  
and my friends for their help.

My thanks are also due to the staff  
of Edinburgh University Library.

# CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ABSTRACT	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
ABBREVIATIONS	vi
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER I THE ARAB TRIBES, THEIR INTER- RELATION AND DISTRIBUTION THROUGHOUT THE PENINSULA	12
CHAPTER II THE CONQUESTS AND TRIBAL MIGRATION	40
a) The Tribes and Umayyad Caliphs	44
b) The Conquest of 'Irāq and settlement of the Tribes	51
c) Kūfa and the settlement of the tribes	57
d) The distribution of the Tribes in Kūfa	60
CHAPTER III THE ARAB TRIBES IN BAṢRA	72
a) The struggle of the Tribes During 'Alī's Period	77
b) Ziyād the governor of Baṣra	80
c) The anarchy after Yazīd's death	84
d) Al-Mukhtār and the Tribes of Baṣra	94
e) Muṣ'ab in Baṣra	96
CHAPTER IV 'IRAQ AS A UNITED PROVINCE	99
a) The Zubairite Period	99
b) The governorship of al-Ḥajjāj	110
c) The Revolt of Ibn al-Ash'ath	119
d) Yemen control 'Irāq after al-Ḥajjāj's death	128
e) The second period of Qaisite control 'Iraq	139

	<u>Page</u>
CHAPTER V THE ARAB TRIBES IN KHURĀSĀN	143
a) The beginning of the Conquests	143
b) Qaisite domination of Khurāsān	155
c) Arab migration into Khurāsān	157
d) Khurāsān after Yazīd's death	160
e) The resistance of Tamīm	165
f) The Umayyad Restoration	167
g) The Azdite Supremacy	172
h) The Revival of Qais	174
i) Azd return to power	180
j) The Arab Tribes in Transoxiana	183
CHAPTER VI THE ARAB TRIBES AND THE COLLAPSE OF THE Umayyad	187
a) The Governorship of Naṣr b. Sayyār	191
b) The Arab Tribes in the last days of Umayyad Rule	196
BIBLIOGRAPHY	202
GENEALOGICAL TABLES	

## ABBREVIATIONS



<u>A'laq</u>	<u>Al-A'laq al-Nafīsa</u> , by Ibn Rusta.
<u>Aghānī</u>	<u>Kitāb al-Aghānī</u> , by Abū 'l-Faraj al-Iṣfahānī.
<u>Akhbār</u>	<u>Akhbār al-'Abbās wa Wildih</u> , (anonymous).
<u>Ansāb</u>	<u>Ansāb al-Ashraf</u> , by al-Balādhurī.
<u>'Asākir</u>	<u>Tahdhib al-Ta'rīkh al-Kabīr and Ta'rīkh Dimashq</u> , by Ibn 'Asākir.
<u>Aṣnām</u>	<u>Kitāb al-Aṣnām</u> , by Ibn al-Kalbī.
<u>Azdī</u>	<u>Ta'rīkh al-Mouṣil</u> , by al-Azdī.
<u>Bad'</u>	<u>Al-Bad' wa 'l-Ta'rīkh</u> , by al-Maqdisī.
<u>Bakrī</u>	<u>Mu'jam ma Ista'jam</u> , by al-Bakrī.
<u>Bayān</u>	<u>Al-Bayān wa 'l-Tabyīn</u> , by al-Jāhiz.
<u>Buldān</u>	<u>Kitāb al-Buldān</u> , by al-Ya'qūbī.
<u>Dīnawarī</u>	<u>Al-Akhbār al-Tiwāl</u> , by al-Dīnawarī.
<u>E.I<sup>1</sup></u>	<u>The Encyclopaedia of Islam</u> .
<u>E.I<sup>2</sup></u>	New edition.
<u>Faqīh</u>	<u>Kitāb al-Buldān</u> , by Ibn al-Faqīh.
<u>Farazdaq</u>	<u>Dīwān</u> .
<u>Fihrist</u>	<u>Kitāb al-Fihrist</u> , by Ibn al-Nadīm.
<u>Futūḥ</u>	<u>Futūḥ al-Buldān</u> , by al-Balādhurī.
<u>G.A.L.s</u>	<u>Geschichte der Arabischen litteratur</u> and the <u>Supplementband</u> , by Brockelmann.
<u>Ḥadā'iq</u>	<u>Al-'Uyūn wa 'l-Ḥadā'iq</u> , (anonymous).
<u>Ḥadhif</u>	<u>Ḥadhif min Nasab Quraish</u> , by Mu'arraḥ al-Sadūsī.
<u>'Ibar</u>	<u>Al-'Ibar</u> , by Ibn Khaldūn.
<u>Ibn Khuradādhba</u>	<u>Al-Masālik wa 'l-Mamālik</u> , by Ibn Khuradādhba.
<u>Iklīl</u>	<u>Kitāb al-Iklīl</u> , by al-Hamdānī.
<u>Imāma</u>	<u>Al-Imāma wa 'l-Siyāsa</u> , by Ibn Qutaiba.

<u>Inbāh</u>	<u>Al-Inbāh 'Alā Qabā'il al-Ruwah</u> , by Ibn 'Abd al-Barr.
<u>'Iqd</u>	<u>Al-'Iqd al-Farīd</u> , by Ibn 'Abd Rabbihi.
<u>Irshād</u>	<u>Irshād al-Arīb</u> , by Yāqūt.
<u>Ishtiqaq</u>	<u>Kitāb al-Ishtiqaq</u> , by Ibn Duraid.
<u>Iṣṭakhrī</u>	<u>Masālik al-Mamālik</u> , by al-Iṣṭakhrī.
<u>Jahshiyārī</u>	<u>Al-Wuzarā' wa 'l-Kuttāb</u> , by al-Jahshiyārī.
<u>Jamharat</u>	<u>Jamharat Ansāb al-'Arab</u> , by Ibn Ḥazm.
<u>Jumahī</u>	<u>Ṭabaqat Fuḥūl al-Shu'arā'</u> , by al-Jumahī.
<u>Kalbī</u>	<u>Jamharat al-Nasab</u> , by Ibn al-Kalbī.
<u>Kāmil</u>	<u>Al-Kāmil fī 'l-Ta'rīkh</u> , by Ibn al-Athīr.
<u>Khalīfa</u>	<u>Ta'rīkh Khalīfa</u> , by Khalīfa b. Khayyāṭ.
<u>Kharāj</u>	<u>Kitāb al-Kharāj</u> , by Abū Yūsuf.
<u>Khawārizmī</u>	<u>Mafātīḥ al-'Ulūm</u> , by al-Khawārizmī.
<u>Kūfī</u>	<u>Kitāb al-Futūḥ</u> , by Ibn A'tham.
<u>Lestrangle</u>	<u>The land of the Eastern Caliphate</u> , by Lestrangle.
<u>Lisān</u>	<u>Lisān al-'Arab</u> , by Ibn Manẓūr.
<u>Lubāb</u>	<u>Al-Lubāb fī Tahdhīb al-Ansāb</u> , by Ibn al-Athīr.
<u>Lughda</u>	<u>Ṣifat Jazirat al-'Arab</u> , by Lughda.
<u>Ma'ārif</u>	<u>Al-Ma'ārif</u> , by Ibn Qutaiba.
<u>Maqdisī</u>	<u>Aḥsan al-Taqāsīm</u> , by al-Maqdisī.
<u>Marāṣid</u>	<u>Marāṣid al-Iṭilā'</u> , by Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥaqq.
<u>Masālik</u>	<u>Al-Masālik wa 'l-Mamālik</u> , by Ibn Ḥawqal.
<u>Māwardī</u>	<u>Al-Aḥkām al-Ṣultāniya</u> , by al-Māwardī.
<u>Mubarrad</u>	<u>Al-Kāmil fī 'l-Lughā</u> , by al-Mubarrad.
<u>Muḥabbar</u>	<u>Kitāb al-Muḥabbar</u> , by Ibn Ḥabīb.
<u>Mu'jam</u>	<u>Mu'jam al-Buldān</u> , by Yāqūt.

<u>Muntakhabāt</u>	<u>Muntakhabāt fī Akhbār al-Yemen</u> , by al-Himyarī.
<u>Muqaddima</u>	<u>Al-Muqaddima</u> , by Ibn Khaldūn.
<u>Murūj</u>	<u>Murūj al-Dhahab</u> , by al-Mas'ūdī.
<u>Nahj</u>	<u>Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāgha</u> , by Ibn Abī 'l-Ḥadīd.
<u>Naqā'id</u>	<u>Naqā'id Jarīr wa 'l-Farazdaq</u> , by Abū Ubaida.
<u>Narshakhī</u>	<u>Ta'rīkh Bukhāra</u> , by al-Narshakhī.
<u>Nujūm</u>	<u>Al-Nujūm al-Zāhira</u> , by Ibn Tahgriberdī.
<u>Nuwayrī</u>	<u>Nihāyat al-Arab fī Funūn al-Adab</u> , by al-Nuwayrī.
<u>Qabā'il</u>	<u>Mukhtalif al-Qabā'il wa Mu'talifiḥā</u> , by Ibn Ḥabīb.
<u>Qalqashandī</u>	<u>Nihāyat al-Arab fī Ma'rifat Qabā'il al-'Arab</u> , by al-Qalqashandī.
<u>Sabā'ik</u>	<u>Sabā'ik al-Dhahab fī Ma'rifat Qabā'il al-'Arab</u> , by al-Suwaydī.
<u>Sam'ānī</u>	<u>Kitāb al-Ansāb</u> , by al-Sam'ānī.
<u>Shi'r</u>	<u>Al-Shi'r wa l-Shu'arā'</u> , by Ibn Qutaiba.
<u>Şifat</u>	<u>Şifat Jazīrat al-'Arab</u> , by al-Hamdānī.
<u>Şiffīn</u>	<u>Kitāb Waq'at Şiffīn</u> , by Naşr b. Muzahim.
<u>Şihāḥ</u>	<u>Kitāb al-Şihāḥ</u> , by al-Jawharī.
<u>Sīra</u>	<u>Sīrat al-Nabī</u> , by Ibn Hishām.
<u>Smith</u>	<u>Kinship and Marriage</u> , by Smith.
<u>Subḥ</u>	<u>Subḥ al-A'shā</u> , by al-Qalqashandī.
<u>Suyūṭī</u>	<u>Ta'rīkh al-Khulafā'</u> , by al-Suyūṭī.
<u>Ṭabaqāt</u>	<u>Al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā</u> , by Ibn Sa'd.
<u>Ṭabarī</u>	<u>Ta'rīkh al-Rusul wa 'l-Mulūk</u> , by al-Ṭabarī.
<u>Tāj</u>	<u>Tāj al-'Arūs</u> , by al-Zabīdī.

<u>Tanbīh</u>	<u>Al-Tanbīh wa 'l-Ishrāf</u> , by al-Mas'ūdī.
<u>Ṭurfat</u>	<u>Ṭurfat al-Aṣḥāb</u> , by Ibn Rasūl.
Wakī'	<u>Akhbār al-Qudāt</u> , by Wakī'.
Wāqidī	<u>Futūḥ al-Shām</u> , by al-Wāqidī.
Wellhausen	<u>Arab Kingdom and its fall</u> , by Wellhausen.
Wüstenfeld	<u>Register zu den genealogischen Tabellen der Arabischen stämme und Familien</u> , by Wüstenfeld.
Ya'qūbī	<u>Ta'rīkh</u> , by al-Ya'qūbī.



## INTRODUCTION

### SURVEY OF THE SOURCES

The sources from which information on the Arab tribes can be collected are, in general, the familiar materials used for the study of Islamic history. In what follows here they will be treated in chronological order and described in terms of the contribution they make to the subject of tribal organisation and distribution.

Al-Minqarī, Naṣr b. Muzāḥim<sup>1</sup> (d. 212/827), a well-known historian and contemporary of al-Wāqidī whose sources are from the same age as those of Abū Mikhnaḥ. Only one of the numerous works attributed to him has survived, the Kitāb Ṣiffīn;<sup>2</sup> of the rest all we know is that they were pro-Shī'a.

The Kitāb Ṣiffīn gives very detailed information about the battle, and of the Arab tribes who were already settled in both Syria and 'Irāq, mentioning the feuds which existed between them and quoting verses which reflect the spirit of hostility. However, it rarely attempts to evaluate the reliability of the materials on which it drew, prominent among which are the accounts of Saif b. 'Omar and Abū Mikhnaḥ.

Ibn Sa'd (d. 230/844), known also, as Kātib al-Wāqidī, is the author of the famous Ṭabaqāt,<sup>3</sup> which deals with the classes of the Companions and their successors down to his own time. Being the earliest work in Arabic of a biographical nature, it is, of course, of immense value as a source of

---

1. Fihrist, p. 137.

2. Ed. by 'Abd 'l-Salām Hārūn, Cairo, 1365.

3. G.A.L., § I, 208.



information about the tribal backgrounds and alliances of the individuals with whom it deals. Much, if not most, of the material which he gives derives from al-Wāqidī,<sup>1</sup> and in fact, Ibn Sa'd may be regarded as the continuator of a work left incomplete at the time of the latter's death.

In the course of his biographies of the religious and pious men of the early generations, he provides much incidental information about the Arab settlers in Kūfa, Baṣra<sup>2</sup> and Khurāsān.<sup>3</sup> His work might be criticised for the absence of any personal view-point or comment on the matters which he treats, but such criticism could equally be directed against most of the historical work of the period. And, as with the latter, the reader should always be aware of the atmosphere of intense religious polemic in which the work was produced, and it cannot be supposed that its glorification of the <sup>founders of</sup> faith was not influenced by the raging Shu'ūbiyya controversy.

Khalīfa b. Khayyāt (d. 240/854).<sup>4</sup> One of the most reliable of the early traditionists and historians. Little is known about his life except that he was from Baṣra, and that he wrote five books,<sup>5</sup> only two of which have survived: Ta'rīkh<sup>6</sup> and Kitāb al-Ṭabaqāt.<sup>7</sup> Khalīfa's Ta'rīkh is the earliest to present its materials in the form of annals.

---

1. Fihrist, p. 145.

2. Ṭabaqāt, III, ii, p. 21; IV, ii, pp. 77-78; V, ii, p. 101.

3. Ibid., V, ii, p. 33.

4. Nujūm, II, 303.

5. Fihrist, p. 324.

6. Ed. by Suhail Zakkār, Damascus, 1967.

7. Ed. by Suhail Zakkār, Damascus, 1966.

It begins with the first year of Hijra and ends in the year 230/844 (eight years before the death of the author). At the end of the reign of each Caliph he supplies a list of the governors of the Provinces, the qādis, the hājibs, the chiefs of the police, the heads of the dīwāns and of the Treasury.<sup>1</sup> In dealing with the early conquests he uses both local information and the official Medinese accounts.<sup>2</sup> His narrative is sometimes very detailed, as for example when he describes the revolt of ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. al-Ash‘ath; but in other places he gives no more than a passing notice to events of importance, such as the revolt of Yazīd b. al-Muhallab.<sup>3</sup> His authorities are Qatāda, ‘Urwa b. al-Zubair, al-Zuhrī and Ibn Ishāq.<sup>4</sup> The work is an invaluable source of information about the tribes in ‘Iraq and Khurāsān. In comparison with Ṭabarī, Khalīfa's work is very abridged. Although they frequently use different authorities, their accounts of many aspects of the early conquests are similar. Both take a very uncritical attitude towards their sources, but whereas Khalīfa usually contents himself with a single version of an event, Ṭabarī will report it through numerous informants.

Al-Balādhurī, Abū ‘l-‘Abbās Aḥmad b. Yaḥya (d. 279/892). Little is known of the life of this great historian, the

---

1. Ta’rīkh, I, pp. 71, 107, 196.

2. Ibid., I, pp. 282, 289.

3. Ibid., I, pp. 5, 13, 80.

4. Ibid., I, 362.

author of the Futūḥ al-Buldān and the Ansāb al-Ashraf.<sup>1</sup> In the Futūḥ,<sup>2</sup> al-Balādhurī describes the Muslim conquest, beginning with the campaigns of the Prophet and continuing with the Wars of the rida, the invasion of Syria, Jazīra, Armīnia, Egypt and the Maghrib, and the occupation of 'Irāq and Persia. The book gives a vivid account of Arab military activity<sup>3</sup> and is of particular importance to the present study for the details it provides of their settlements in Kūfa and Baṣra, as well as their incursions into Khurāsān and the other Persia Provinces. His sources are often identified, and include such names as Abū Mikhnat, Hishām al-Kalbī, al-Wāqidī and al-Madā'inī.<sup>4</sup> He is not uncritical in his treatment of these materials, and for certain events he reports more than one version;<sup>5</sup> moreover, he also makes use of popular tradition in his narratives.<sup>6</sup>

His Ansāb al-Ashraf<sup>7</sup> is an extensive work on Arab genealogy, and one of the most important sources for the history of the tribes in 'Irāq and Khurāsān. It preserves valuable information about the views which the tribes held of one another, and describes their relations between them-

---

1. G.A.L., S I, 216; Fihrist, p. 164.

2. Ed. by Riḍwān Muḥammad, Cairo, 1932.

3. As for example, when he describes how 'Irāq was subjugated after the battle of al-Qādisiyya.

4. Futūḥ, pp. 136, 322.

5. Ibid., p. 147.

6. Ibid., pp. 148, 308.

7. For the present study volumes 2, 3 and 4 of the 32 volume manuscript copy in the Institute of Higher Islamic Studies in Baghdād were used.

selves, as well as those they maintained with the government. Although al-Ansāb is arranged in the ṭabaqāt style of Ibn Sa'd, it introduces more historical events into the genealogical ~~frame~~-work. Al-Balādhurī used the works of his predecessors in this field and often is to be seen combining information derived from Ibn Ishāq and Ibn Sa'd. However, he uses his sources very intelligently, giving them in the original whenever possible, and it is for this reason that he enjoyed such a high reputation among subsequent scholars. Frequently, he sheds additional light on events passed over briefly by Ṭabarī.

Al-Dīnawarī, Abū Ḥanīfa Aḥmad b. Dāwūd (d. 282/895), the philologist and naturalist. He was born in Dīnawar in Persia, and received his education in Khurāsān, Kūfa and Baṣra.<sup>1</sup> Although he is said to have written more than ten books, only his al-Akhbār al-Ṭiwāl<sup>2</sup> has survived in its entirety.<sup>3</sup> Without mentioning his sources, he gives a detailed account of the conquest of 'Irāq by the Arabs, with particular attention to important events, such as the battle of Qādisiyya and Ṣiffīn. His remarks on the relations between the tribes and the Caliphs is very interesting.<sup>4</sup> A detailed account is given of al-Mukhtār's

---

1. G.A.L., I, 123; S I, 187; Fihrist, p. 326.

2. Ed. by Vladimir Guirgass, Leiden, 1888.

3. C. Brockelmann, E.I., I, 977, S.V. Dīnawarī.

4. For example, pp. 326, 350, when he speaks about the relation between Hishām b. 'Abd al-Malik and Yemenī tribes; also his report about Mudar, Qais and <sup>the</sup> Tamīm and their relations with the Caliph Marwān b. Muḥammad.



revolution and those who supported him during his struggle.<sup>1</sup> His description of the situation in Baṣra after the death of Yazīd I, is invaluable,<sup>2</sup> as is, also, his account of the relations between Tamīm and the governors of ʿIrāq.<sup>3</sup> He gives precise information about the affairs of Muṣʿab b. al-Zubair and the ʿIrāqī tribes,<sup>4</sup> and elucidates many facts affecting the tribal feuds. He is impartial and balanced in the presentation of his facts, and displays no traces of a partisan spirit.

Al-Yaʿqūbī, Ahmad b. Abī Yaʿqūb (d. 284/895).<sup>5</sup>

The historian and geographer to whom more than four books are attributed, the most famous being al-Taʾrīkh and al-Buldān. The Taʾrīkh, arranged according to the reigns of the various Caliphs, is very concise in its information and rarely refers to the sources from which this is derived. Major events such as the Battle of Camel and Siffīn, are treated in some detail,<sup>6</sup> but usually the accounts are summary and unrelated to one another. In places, differing versions of the same incident are given, <sup>and</sup> in certain cases

---

1. Dīnawarī, p. 299.

2. Ibid., p. 295.

3. Ibid., pp. 181, 282, 312.

4. Ibid., pp. 318-319.

5. G.A.L., S I, 405; Irshād, i, 237.

6. E.g., his account of the tribes who supported ʿAlī gives valuable data on the tribes in this area. II, pp. 128, 133.



he is the unique source for events.<sup>1</sup> Most interesting are the descriptions of the Caliphs and the provincial governors,<sup>2</sup> and the information given on the administrative system.<sup>3</sup> The reports on the Arab who settled in 'Irāq and Khurāsān and their feuds are of primary importance to the present study.<sup>4</sup> In his presentation of historical materials, al-Ya'qūbī is similar to his contemporary al-Dīnawarī, both in respect of the sources which they used and the way in which they drew upon them.

Al-Ṭabarī, Abū Ja'far Muḥammad b. Jarīr (d. 310/923), historian and scholar, was born in 225/839 at Āmul in Ṭabaristān.<sup>5</sup> His most important work, the Ta'rīkh al-Rusul wa 'l-Mulūk, begins with the creation and, continuing through the legendary history of the Prophets and the pre-Islamic dynasties, gains its greatest importance when it reaches the period of Muḥammad and the states formed by the Muslims down to 290/902.

He brings to his historical writing the technique of the Muḥaddithūn, setting side by side without comment all versions of each event which he could find and providing, thereby, a wealth of detail lacking in all the other histories.

- 
1. E.g., his is the only surviving account of 'Abd al-Malik b. Marwān's efforts to dissuade his brother 'Abd al-'Azīz from claiming the Caliphate and to put his own son al-Walīd next in line of succession, III, 21.
  2. E.g. his treatment of Mu'āwiya and his governors, especially Amr b. al-'Āṣ and Ziyād b. Abīhi, II, pp. 161, 166.
  3. Ya'qūbī, II, pp. 163, 170, 172.
  4. *Ibid.*, II, pp. 98-100; III, pp. 10, 27, 33.
  5. *Fihrist*, p. 326; R. Paret, *E.I.*<sup>1</sup>, IV, 578, S.V. Ṭabarī.

The work is arranged in the form of annals for each year of Hijra, beginning with the era of the Prophet. His materials come from a wide range of authorities, such as Abū Mikhnaf, 'Omar b. Shabba, Naṣr b. Muzāḥim, al-Madā'inī, Saif b. 'Omar, al-Wāqidī and Ibn al-Kalbī, some of whom only survive through his extensive quotation from their works.

Comparison of Ṭabarī with Khalīfa b. Khayyāt, Balādhurī, Ibn A'tham and al-Azdī shows how numerous and diverse were the materials on which he based his work, and the neutral position he took in relating events. Khalīfa's Ta'rikh, despite its value, is very brief, and uncritical in its information, and in this respect is totally different from that of Ṭabarī.<sup>1</sup> Balādhurī, however, often gives the same information as Ṭabarī, some times more and some times less detailed.<sup>2</sup> Ibn A'tham contains much more information on certain aspects of the conquests and, especially, on their course in the regions of the East, and in this respect he is an invaluable supplement to Ṭabarī. Thus, the campaigns in Khurāsān and the relations of the Arabs here among themselves and with the natives are treated more fully in the Futūḥ than in any other source.<sup>3</sup> Al-Azdī, although he does not acknowledge his dependence on Ṭabarī, in large part merely repeats information to be found in the

---

1. Compare, for example, the account of the rebellion against the Caliph 'Uthmān in Khalīfa, Ta'rikh, I, 181, with that in Ṭabarī, IV, 340.

2. See, Futūḥ, pp. 128, 178; Ṭabarī, IV, pp. 70, 71; Ansāb, V, pp. 87, 138, 157; Ṭabarī, VII, pp. 97, 189.

3. Kūfī, I, f. 297; II, ff. 183, 186, 189.

latter. However, he uses other works unknown to Ṭabarī and draws on materials not utilized in any other sources.<sup>1</sup>

As for virtually every other aspect of early Islamic history, for the subject here studied, also, Ṭabarī's is the indispensable work, not only for the quantity of information it contains but, also, for the impartial way in which it is presented.

Ibn Aʿtham al-Kūfī, Abū Muḥammad Aḥmad b. ʿAlī.

Little is known of his life, other than that he died about 314/926.<sup>2</sup> His Futūḥ begins with the Caliphate of ʿUthmān b. ʿAffān and continues down to the revolt of Bābak in the reign of al-Muʿtaṣim (222/832), presenting wide and detailed information on all the events of which it treats. In this respect it is superior to Balādhurī as a source; and, while not so extensive as Ṭabarī, it still provides a useful complement to the information provided therein. Covering the whole of the Umayyad period, Ibn Aʿtham follows the migrations of the Arabs into ʿIrāq and Khurāsān, and dwells on the major events in which they were involved in these regions. In treating of the revolts which took place in ʿIrāq, he shows himself to be sympathetic to the tribes settled here, as might be expected from a man who was himself local.<sup>3</sup> He provides one of the most interesting accounts of Qutaiba's conquests in Transoxiana, and of all

---

1. Azdī, II, 24.

2. Irshād, I, 379; C. Brockelmann, E.I.<sup>1</sup>, II, 364, S.v. Ibn Aʿtham.

3. Kūfī, II, ff.64,68.

the sources he gives the most circumstantial information about the settlement of the Arabs here and in Khurāsān and of their relations with the natives.<sup>1</sup> Indeed, as regards the Persian provinces, Ibn A'tham can be regarded as a source superior to Ṭabarī.

Al-Azdī, Abū Zakariyya Yazīd b. Muḥammad b. al-Qāsim (d. 334/945), the author of the Ta'rīkh al-Mouṣil, is, also, hardly known apart from this one book. His successors, such as Ibn al-Athīr and Ibn Khaldūn, used his work extensively, but they too seem to have known little of his life. His work is one of the first attempts at regional history in Arabic, and must be regarded as a highly creditable achievement in this field,<sup>2</sup> relating the local events to the general development of affairs in the Empire. The work was in three volumes, of which only the second has survived, covering the period from 101/719 to 224/326. Apart from written sources such as Abū Mikhnaf, Abū 'Ubaida, Khalīfa b. Khayyāṭ and Ṭabarī, al-Azdī also collected his materials from tradition and eye-witnesses;<sup>3</sup> one can notice the influence of Ṭabarī in the style of writing and the method of presentation, and, indeed, he at times quotes directly from him. Its chief importance for the present study lies in the information it provides about the feuding between Qais and Kalb towards the end of the Umayyad Period, and no source more clearly presents the problems with which

---

1. Kūfī, II, ff.93,95.

2. F. Rosenthal, E.I.<sup>1</sup>, I, 813, S.v. Azdī.

3. Azdī, II, pp. 23,29,138.



the last Caliph, Marwān b. Muḥammad, was confronted.

Al-Masʿūdī, Abū 'l-Hasan 'Alī b. al-Ḥusain (d. 346/957), is one of the most famous of all Arab historians. According to his own statement, he was born in Baghdād,<sup>1</sup> so Ibn al-Nadīm's description of him as a Maghribī must be discounted.<sup>2</sup> Of the five books which he is said to have written, only three have survived: Murūj al-Dhahab, al-Tanbīh wa 'l-Ishrāf, and a part of the Akhbār al-Zamān.

Unfortunately, the works which are lost contained his extensive accounts of the period treated, and both the Murūj and Tanbīh are avowedly no more than simplified condensations of these. In style, his works are similar to that of Yaʿqūbī, very concise and with only the major events being given any detailed attention. He does not always mention the name of the source upon which he drew, even when quoting verbatim. The Murūj is valuable in that it gives interesting data on the Arab tribes, and he seems to have had a particular interest in the affairs of 'Irāq during the Umayyad period.<sup>3</sup>

---

1. Irshād, VII, 148.

2. Fihrist, p. 219.

3. Murūj, III, pp. 37, 152.



## CHAPTER I

### THE ARAB TRIBES

#### Their inter-relation and distribution throughout the Peninsula.

Those problems which grew out of Arab tribalism in the conquered territories had their origins in the social organization of the home-land, where common genealogies and territorial proximity shaped the patterns of alliance and hostility that were to be brought by them into regions where they had neither meaning nor purpose. The frequent irrational behaviour of political groups in the Provinces of the Umayyad Empire can be explained to some degree by memories of older loyalties and alliances, most of which were fictitious, but none the less of importance. The fact that the genealogies were transmitted orally greatly facilitated distortion, and created an obscurity wherein a variety of motives could operate. Moreover, the political rivalries of the Arab leaders during the early years of Islam and the conquests supplied an incentive for falsification even of such genealogical tradition that might have had some authenticity.<sup>1</sup>

The genealogists divide the Arabs into three categories: the extinct Arabs (bā'ida), the genuine Arabs ('āriba) and the naturalised Arabs (musta'riba), tracing the ultimate origins of the race to the two major branches:

---

1. Inbāh, p. 107.

Qaḥṭān in Yemen and ʿAdnān in Ḥijāz.<sup>1</sup> Al-Maqdisī specifies this somewhat further, having the ʿAdnān branch include all those Arabs who were not of Qaḥṭān, and tracing their ancestry to the sons at Nizār, Muḍar and Rabīʿa.<sup>2</sup> Ibn Ḥazm, however, claims that all Arabs go back to a single ancestor, except for the three people: Tanūkh, al-ʿItq, and Ghassān, each of which was a composite of various lines (butūn).<sup>3</sup> However he had earlier mentioned that all Arabs descend from the three individuals: ʿAdnān, Qaḥṭān and Quḍāʿa.<sup>4</sup> Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr would have the Arabs descend in three lines from Nizār, Yemen and Quḍāʿa.<sup>5</sup>

Such genealogical classification has already been called into question by European scholars such as Nöldeke and Goldziher, and it is obvious from the lack of consistency between the various accounts that much of it was of later invention. Nöldeke thought that it was created by the people of the Yemen in order that they might claim full participation in Islām, while Goldziher illustrates from pre-Islamic alliances and feuds the ways in which the premises of such classification are contradicted.<sup>6</sup> Thus we find Jadīla (of Qaḥṭān) and Shaibān (of ʿAdnān) allied together against ʿAbs (of ʿAdnān), cutting across the two-

- 
1. A convenient summary of the statements of the genealogists can be found in Ṭahā Ḥussain, Fī al-Adab al-Jāhilī, p. 82.
  2. Badʿ, IV, 124.
  3. Jamharat, p. 431; This is the genealogy which is given by Ibn Khaldūn in al-ʿIbar, II, 521.
  4. Jamharat, p. 6.
  5. Inbāh, p. 64.
  6. Goldziher, Muhammedanische studien, I, 92.

part division laid down by the genealogies.<sup>1</sup> Again, Aws and Khazraj are presented as being of the same descent, whereas all our information about them shows that they had always been enemies. Qais b. al-Khaṭīm (of Aws) urges his people to revenge the defeat they suffered at the hands of the Khazraj in the battles (ayyām) of Muḍarris and Mu‘abbis,<sup>2</sup> which would seem to indicate that they were of different tribal origins. Moreover, the same poet is found asking for help from the Quraish (who were of ‘Adnān) against the Khazraj, even though he himself, as a man of Aws, is presumed to be from Qaḥṭān; and by the terms in which he speaks it would seem that he regarded the Quraish as of closer blood-relationship than the Khazraj.

Other contradictions in the conventional genealogical classification of the tribes can be demonstrated. Certain sources present Quḍā‘a as descending from the ‘Adnān line, saying that he was born of Ma‘add b. ‘Adnān and a woman from Saba’, and this can be attested in both the pre- and post-Jāhiliyya Quḍā‘ite poems.<sup>3</sup> Others, however, claim that it is to the Yemen that he belongs, presenting his ancestry as: Quḍā‘a b. Mālīk b. ‘Amr b. Murra b. Zaid b. Mālīk b. Ḥimyar.<sup>4</sup> This Yemen ancestry seems to be a later invention, dating from the period when the people of Quḍā‘a

---

1. Goldziher, op.cit., I, 93.

2. Qais b. al-Khaṭīm, Dīwān, pp. 25,33,79; Ḥassān b. Thābit, Dīwān, pp.83-4.

3. Zubairī, p. 5; Bakrī, I, 19; Jamharat, p. 411; Smith, p.8.

4. Kalbī, (ed. Caskel) II, 229; Jamharat, p. 440.

became associated with the Kalb in their wars with Qais. This was in the reign of the Umayyad Marwān b. al-Ḥakam, but before this time they were regarded as being descended from Maʿadd.<sup>1</sup> The political motives underlying such claims to one or another ancestry in the early period most probably arose from the rivalries with which the throne itself was surrounded,<sup>2</sup> but one must <sup>not</sup> exclude the possibility that the genealogists themselves may have had personal reasons for tampering with the lines of descent of friends or enemies.<sup>3</sup>

The confusion that this can give rise to may be seen in the case of the tribe of Bajīla: those of this tribe who settled in Syria and North Africa are regarded as descending from Anmār b. Nizār,<sup>4</sup> while the others were attributed to a Yemenī line.<sup>5</sup> Similarly with the tribe of Khathʿam, some members of which are said to descend from ʿAdnān, but others presumed to be from the Yemen. Al-Masʿūdī accepts both Bajīla and Khathʿam as being of Nizār, and asserts that it

---

1. Tāj, V, 470.

2. Inbāh, p. 107, mentions the efforts of the early Umayyads to collect about them the strongest of the tribal groups, and these presumably were provided with the most noble ancestries. In the Aghānī, VIII, 77, there is another reference to the dependency of the Umayyads on the Kalb at this time.

3. Iklīl, X, 30, complains that the genealogists of Syria and ʿIrāq abbreviate the lines of descent of Qaḥṭān and Mālik b. Ḥimyar so that they will not be longer than those of the northern Arabs, descended from Ismāʿīl.

4. Zubairī, p. 7; Murūj, II, 163.

5. Kalbī (ed. Caskel) II, 221; ʿIqd, III, 338.



was only out of enmity that they were said to be from the Yemen.<sup>1</sup> Al-Ya'qūbī tries to harmonize this by assuming that Anmār married a woman of the Yemen and that his sons Bajīla and Khath'am are thus connected to the people of this region only through their mother's line.<sup>2</sup> Levi Della Vida explains the confusion by asserting that Khath'am was not an ethnic unit, but rather a confederation of clans of different origins.<sup>3</sup> Likewise, the tribe of 'Akk is confused in its origins, those who settled in the East being derived from Azd; while those in the Yemen and other regions are given a descent from 'Adnān.<sup>4</sup> Hudād, too, is variously said to be descended from Kināna or from Tayy.<sup>5</sup>

This confusion is further complicated by the appearance of the same clan name in different tribes. Thus, in four tribes of 'Adnān, the clan name Asad is to be found: Asad b. 'Abd al-'Uzzā, Asad b. Khuzaima, Asad b. Rabī'a and Asad b. Dāwūd. There is, also an Asad to be found in one of the tribes of Qaḥṭān.<sup>6</sup>

The same confusion exists in respect of the Banū Sa'd from Tamīm and another Sa'ad from Kilāb;<sup>7</sup> and there

1. Murūj, II, 163; Tāj, VIII, 268.

2. Ya'qūbī, I, 195.

3. E.I.<sup>1</sup>, II, 924, s.V. Khath'am.

4. Zubairī, p. 5.

5. Qabā'il, p. 25.

6. Sam'ānī, p. 32. Ibn Ḥabīb wrote a treatise on this problem, Mukhtalif al-Qabā'il wa Mu'talifiḥā (ed. F. Wüstenfeld, Gottingen, 1805).

7. Ḥamāsa, I, 57.



is a Jarm from Tayy and a Jarm from Qudā'a.<sup>1</sup> Similarly, one Muhārib comes from 'Abd al-Qais and another from Qais 'Ailān;<sup>2</sup> and we find Jusham b. Hamdān and Jusham b. al-Hārith from Qaḥṭān as well as Jusham b. Bakr from 'Adnān.<sup>3</sup> There is a Ghaṭāfan from Yemen and a Ghaṭāfān from 'Adnān;<sup>4</sup> as a Māzin from Taim (Qaḥṭān) and Māzin from Qais ('Adnān).<sup>5</sup> Confusion of this sort has made the study of tribal genealogy difficult even to the native specialists in the subject, as when Ibn Duraid says that al-Ribāb consists of: Taim, 'Adī, 'Ukl, Muzaina and Dabba,<sup>6</sup> while according to al-Jawharī the clans were: Dabba, Thawr, 'Ukl, Taim and Adī.<sup>7</sup>

We cannot know at what period the first efforts at systematizing the genealogical relations of the various tribes were made, but some impetus must certainly have been given to it by the Dīwān drawn up by the Caliph 'Omar b. al-Khaṭṭāb. Although this was primarily a register of those entitled to receive 'aṭā';<sup>8</sup> it was also the earliest

1. Hamāsa, I, 75; 293; Ṣubḥ, I, 318.

2. 'Iqd, III, 313.

3. Lisān, XIV, 367.

4. Nuwairī, II, 308.

5. Hamāsa, I, 219.

6. Ishtiqāq, p. 180.

7. Ṣiḥāḥ, I, 132; Qalqashandī, p. 133.

8. According to the Ibn Sa'd, Tabaqāt, III, i, 214, 219, everyone was included in 'Omar's dīwān, even those who had no tribal or clan connections. He also implies that the dīwān had regional divisions, and he mentions a dīwān for Ḥimyar (III, i, 215) and Ḥabasha and Khath'am (III, ii, 167). When Bilāl, whose association was with Khath'am, went to Syria, he asked that his name be recorded alongside that of his friend Abū Ruwayḥa in the dīwān of Ḥabash, and in

(Contd.)

example of a classification of society and could have stimulated similar attempts in respect of the older organization of the Arab people. Unfortunately, our knowledge of 'Omar's dīwān, too, is very scant,<sup>1</sup> and the sources give us even less information as to what was the practice in respect of the 'aṭā' in the time of the Prophet and Abū Bakr.

The genealogists never make reference to the dīwān, ~~which~~ <sup>which</sup> may merely mean that by the time of the earliest of these works it had already become inactive. Indeed, this must have happened in the mid-Umayyad period, when the revenues of the state were no longer adequate to support such a body of Pensioners, and the only advantage that remained to being included in the registers was the political association that could be claimed on this basis. But the more systematic efforts of the genealogists was to supplant this purpose, also, and by the time the earliest histories came to be written the dīwān of 'Omar is but a distant memory. In fact, with the passing of the Umayyads, genealogy itself begins to lose importance in the Eastern Islamic world and it is only in Spain that it continues to be pursued with any important purpose.

---

Contd.) agreeing to this 'Omar went even further and included the whole of the latter dīwān into that of Khath'am (Ibid., 167).

Māwardī, p. 202, states that 'Omar designated the Yemenites and the Qaisites in Syria and 'Irāq as distinct groups within the dīwān; and Ṭabarī, IV, 219, mentions similar classification for 'Akk and Himyar.

In the Umayyad Period individuals were incorporated in the dīwān of Quraish as a mark of special favour, Aghānī, XXI, 14.

1. Ya'qūbī, II, 107; Jahshiyārī, p. 17; Puin, Der Dīwān von 'Umar Ibn al-Ḥaṭṭab, p. 115.

### Qaḥṭānite tribes

The southern Arabs are held to descend from Qaḥṭān, the main subdivisions of which are Ḥimyar and Kahlān.

#### Ḥimyar.

It would appear that Ḥimyar consisted of a vast number of tribes in the Yemen,<sup>1</sup> and that the eponymous Ḥimyar himself was also known as al-‘Aranj<sup>2</sup> or al-‘Aranjaj.<sup>3</sup> Ḥimyar was sub-divided into Wā’il and Mālik,<sup>4</sup> and stemming from the latter was the important branch of Quḍā‘a which was given the descent: Quḍā‘a b. ‘Amr b. Murra b. Zaid b. Mālik b. Ḥimyar.<sup>5</sup> Certain historians would make this Quḍā‘a one of the three original progenitors of all the Arabs, along with Nizār and Yemen.<sup>6</sup> As a result of conflict between the brothers Wā’il and Mālik, the latter left Yemen and went to al-Shiḥr.<sup>7</sup> His son al-Ḥāfī, who is said to have ruled the Yemen after his father's death, had three sons: ‘Amr, ‘Imrān and Aslum.<sup>8</sup> The sub-divisions of the ‘Imrān are: Taghlib al-Ghalbā’, Salīḥ, Rabbān, Tazīd and Ghushaim;<sup>9</sup> and these were the first south Arabians to emigrate from

---

1. Jamharat, p. 329; ‘Ibar, II, 507.

2. Qaḥṭān, p. 8.

3. Ishtiqāq, p. 362; Jamharat, 329.

4. Jamharat, p. 432; Sabā’ik, p. 18.

5. ‘Iod, III, 371; Jamharat, p. 440; ‘Ibar, II, 515.

6. Inbāḥ, p. 63.

7. Tāj, X, 94.

8. Ishtiqāq, p. 536; ‘Ibar, II, 515.

9. Ishtiqāq, p. 537; Tāj, II, 160.

Yemen to the north, where they settled in Mesopotamia - al-Jazīra al-Furātiya - and built the city of al-Ḥaḍr.<sup>1</sup> According to al-Bakrī, they dwelt in a place called 'Abqar;<sup>2</sup> until the Persian King Shāpūr invaded the region and destroyed their city. The survivors fled to Syria and settled with their kinsmen, the Tanūkh.<sup>3</sup> Ibn al-Kalbī also locates them in Ḥaḍr and mentions one of their kings, al-Ḍaizan.<sup>4</sup> Ya'qūbī states that Qudā'a was the first tribe to enter Syria.<sup>5</sup> It seems that as a result of feuds among the Qudā'a, certain sections of them left Yemen, some going to Tihāma and others to Syria. Those who settled in Tihāma left there during their struggle with 'Anaza and went to the Najd, from where the brothers Juhaina and Hudhaim split off from the main body and went to the desert, while other sections proceeded on to Baḥrain.<sup>6</sup> Those were Taim al-Lāt and Tanūkh, but subsequently the latter led by their chief Mālīk b. Zuhair left Baḥrain for 'Irāq where they built the city of Ḥīra.<sup>7</sup>

The sub-groups of 'Amr b. al-Ḥāfī were: Balī, Bahrā', and Khawlān.<sup>8</sup> Balī settled in the Shaghb and Bada, places

1. Mu'jam, II, 72.

2. Bakrī, I, 22.

3. Mu'jam, II, 72.

4. Tabarī, II, pp. 61-62.

5. Ya'qūbī, I, 178.

6. Ishtiqaq, 546; Bakrī, I, pp. 21, 30; Mu'jam, III, 368.

Those were called the Ṣuḥār, the men of the desert; their descent is from Zaid b. Laith b. Sūd b. Aslum b. al-Ḥāfī b. Qudā'a.

7. Jamharat, p. 453; see, Ḥamāsa, I, 239; Mu'jam, II, 375.

8. Muntakhabāt, p. 9.



between Taimā' and Medīna.<sup>1</sup> The sub-divisions of Taghlib b. Ḥulwān were: Asad, al-Namir, Kalb, Taghlib and Bakr, all of them sons of Wabra b. Taghlib.<sup>2</sup> The sub-divisions of Asad b. Wabra were: Fahm, Taim Allāh and Shai'Allāt.<sup>3</sup> Tanūkh descends from Taim Allāh,<sup>4</sup> while the Banū al-Qain descend from Shai'Allāt and they subsequently settled in Syria.<sup>5</sup> The sub-divisions of al-Namir b. Wabra were: Taim, Ji'thima, Khushain, Qutba and Ghādira.<sup>6</sup> We only have information about the settlement of the Ghādira, of which Yāqūt says: Līna, a place in the al-Namir area, having fresh pure water, which belongs to Banū Ghādira.<sup>7</sup> He also mentions them in connection with another watering-place called Maṣlūq.<sup>8</sup>

The largest and most famous group of Quḍā'a was Kalb b. Wabra b. Taghlib b. Ḥulwān b. 'Imrān b. al-Ḥāfī,<sup>9</sup> which at first settled in Dumat al-Jandal,<sup>10</sup> and then extended its influence over the area to the west of the Euphrates. Al-Hamdānī includes among their territories Palmyra, Salamīya, 'Āṣimīya, Ḥimṣ, Ḥamā, Shaizar and the

---

1. Bakrī, I, 22.

2. 'Iqd, III, 371; Jamharat, p. 452.

3. Jamharat, p. 453.

4. Ḥamāsa, I, 237.

5. Inbāh, p. 121.

6. Jamharat, p. 452.

7. Mu'jam, IV, 375.

8. Ibid., IV, 555.

9. Jamharat, p. 425; Inbāh, p. 121.

10. Ṭabaqāt, I, i, 64. Ṭabarī, IV, 44.



lands extending to al-Samāwa and the Euphrates.<sup>1</sup> According to Yāqūt, they also occupied the area between Ba‘labak, Hims and Damascus called Biqā‘ Kalb which contained many attractive villages with fresh and pure water.<sup>2</sup> Many other places are mentioned as belonging to Kalb such as: Furāqid, a watering-place in al-Samāwa,<sup>3</sup> Šū‘r, another watering-place near Kūfa,<sup>4</sup> Ghurrah, a mountain in Syria.<sup>5</sup> Al-Bakrī relates that Kalb at first settled in Najd, but, unable to resist the Nizārite tribes which occupied this district after their move from Tihāma,<sup>6</sup> they were forced to migrate.

Aslum b. al-Ḥafī<sup>7</sup> had one son called Sūd, from whom was born Hawtaka and Laith. The chief sub-divisions of Laith were: Sa‘d Hudhaim, Nahd and Juhaina who were sons of Zaid b. Laith.<sup>8</sup> Sa‘d Hudhaim migrated to Najd<sup>9</sup> and Nahd to Wādī al-Qurā, where they settled in a place named al-Ḥijr.<sup>10</sup> Al-Hamdānī describes the territory of the Juhaina thus: "the al-‘īṣ belonging to Juhaina, extends from Raḍwā and al-Ash‘ar to the Red Sea."<sup>11</sup> One section of Juhaina settled in Dhī al-Marwa and Faif while another was located

1. Ṣifat, p. 132, see Bakrī, I, 45.

2. Mu‘jam, I, 699.

3. Ibid., IV, 49.

4. Ibid., III, 431.

5. Ibid., III, 783. For other regions of Kalb, cf. Mu‘jam, III, 587; IV, 522, 1024.

6. Bakrī, I, 45.

7. Qabā’il, p. 5; Sabā’ik, p. 25.

8. ‘Iqd, III, pp. 374-375.

9. Bakrī, I, 30.

10. Ibid., I, 23.

11. Ṣifat, p. 131.

in Khaibar.<sup>1</sup> Yāqūt *mentions* the Juhaina of a place in Khaibar called Laḍā.<sup>2</sup> The chief sub-divisions of Sa'd Hudhaim were: al-Ḥārith and 'Udhra.<sup>3</sup> 'Udhra emigrated from Yemen after a struggle with the other tribes and settled in al-Ḥijāz, where they made a confederation with the Jews.<sup>4</sup> According to al-Iṣfahānī, the 'Udhra were located in Taimā',<sup>5</sup> but Yāqūt also mentions another place belonging to them called Ashghab which lay between Medīna and Taimā'.<sup>6</sup>

### Kahlān

The other main branch of Saba' was Kahlān,<sup>7</sup> the chief sub-divisions of which were Nabt and al-Khīyār.<sup>8</sup> From Nabt derives the famous tribe of Azd.

### Azd

The genealogy of this tribe is given as: Azd b. al-Ghawth b. Nabt b. Zaid b. Kahlān;<sup>9</sup> and more than twenty-five sub-divisions are attributed to it.<sup>10</sup> According to al-Jawharī, Azd is divided into three parts: Azd-Shanū'a,

---

1. Bakrī, I, 38.

2. Mu'jam, IV, 358.

3. Turfat, p. 14; Qalqashandī, p. 341.

4. Tabaqāt, IV, ii, 740.

5. Aghānī, XIV, 161.

6. Mu'jam, III, 302.

7. Inbāh, p. 10; Muntakhabāt, p. 94.

8. Ishtiqāq, p. 218; Iklīl, X, 1.

9. Muntakhabāt, p. 3.

10. Inbāh, p. 106; Turfat, p. 6. Some historians hold that it is one of the major branches of Qaḥṭān, Inbāh, p. 106.

Azd-al-Sarāt and Azd 'Umān;<sup>1</sup> to which a fourth Azd Ghassān is sometimes added,<sup>2</sup> their names being taken from the places in which they were settled. Shanū'a and al-Sarāt were located in the Yemen, the former being about forty-two miles from Sanā'.<sup>3</sup> Al-Sarāt, too, seems to have been among their settlements, for Yāqūt, in speaking of the al-'Udāf, locates it in the territories of Azd.<sup>4</sup> It was probably feuds among the Azd in the Yemen that caused a section of them, led by Mālik b. Fahm, to migrate to al-Bahrain and 'Umān,<sup>5</sup> while others went to Syria and settled near a watering-place named Ghassān,<sup>6</sup> even though all the sources agree in attributing these emigrations of the Azd and other Qaḥṭānite tribes to the bursting of the dam of Ma'rib.<sup>7</sup> However, it is known that this latter event must have occurred between the years 543 A.D. and 570 A.D.,<sup>8</sup> while the genealogists place the emigrations in a period much more remote. The legendary quality of these attempts to connect the tribes of the north with the Yemen has long been recognized.<sup>9</sup> Tāha Ḥusain is no doubt correct when he dismisses those accounts as the inventions

1. Sabā'ik, p. 33.

2. Mu'jam, III, 330.

3. Mu'jam, III, 330. See, Iklīl, VIII, 278.

4. Mu'jam, III, 620.

5. Iklīl, VIII, pp. 282-3.

6. Iklīl, VIII, 284. For detailed information about Ghassān, cf. Iklīl, VIII, 271.

7. Iklīl, VIII, pp. 54-55, 269; Maidānī, Majma' al-Amthāl, I, pp. 384-385.

8. Grohmann, E.I.<sup>1</sup>, III, 291. S.V. Ma'rib.

9. Goldziher, Muḥammedanische studien, I, 92.

of story-tellers, and places the emigrations wholly in the Islamic period; their attribution to ancient times by the historians probably had a political motivation<sup>1</sup> - the feuds between the Qaḥṭānite and the 'Adnānite tribes -.

The most famous branch of Azd was Māzin, which included the four Ghassānite tribes settled in Syria: Mālik, al-Ḥārith, Jafna and Ka'b;<sup>2</sup> Bāriq, which resided in the vicinity of Kūfa;<sup>3</sup> Aws and Khazraj<sup>4</sup> (including Jusham) which lived in Yathrib,<sup>5</sup> Salāmān<sup>6</sup> and Hawāzin.<sup>7</sup>

There is a problem about the origins of Khuzā'a, some of the genealogists connecting it to Azd in the line: Khuzā'a b. 'Amr b. Luḥay b. Ḥāritha b. 'Amr Mazīqiyā b. 'Amr-Mā'al-Samā' b. Ḥāritha b. Imr' al-Qais b. Tha'laba b. Māzin b. Azd.<sup>8</sup> According to this version, Khuzā'a left Ma'rīb with other Azdite tribes until they reached Mecca, where it separated from them, settling in this region and in Mar al-Dahrān, while the others went to Syria.<sup>9</sup> Other genealogists state that the Khuzā'a descend from Muḍar in the line: Khuzā'a b. 'Amr b. Luḥay b. Qam'a b. al-Yās b. Muḍar.<sup>10</sup> From 'Amr b. Luḥay there comes firstly, Salūl<sup>11</sup> which is mentioned by Yāqūt as holding such watering-

1. Fī al-Adab al-Jāhilī, p. 94.

2. Jamharat, p. 331; Muntakhabāt, p. 80; Mu'jam, VI, 292.

3. Jamharat, p. 367; Bakrī, I, 221; Mu'jam, II, 32.

4. 'Iqd, III, 376; Jamharat, p. 332.

5. Iklīl, VIII, 278.

6. Ishtiqāq, p. 35.

7. Jamharat, p. 240.

8. 'Iqd, III, 381; Nuwayrī, II, 317.

9. Muntakhabāt, pp. 30-33; See Ishtiqāq, p. 477; Tāj, V, 317.

10. Iklīl, VIII, 278.

11. Jamharat, p. 235.



places as: Sa'da near Makhammir,<sup>1</sup> Najaba,<sup>2</sup> Shubaika,<sup>3</sup> Mujtabiya<sup>4</sup> and Makhdurā'.<sup>5</sup> Secondly comes Ghādira b. Ḥabshīyya b. Ka'b b. 'Amr b. Luḥay.<sup>6</sup> Two other celebrated sections of Azd were Ghāfiq b. al-Shāhid b. 'Alqama b. 'Akk b. 'Adnān b. 'Abdallāh b. Azd,<sup>7</sup> and the Banū Rāsib, both of whom descended from Maida'an b. Mālik b. Naṣr b. Azd.<sup>8</sup>

The second son of Ghawth is 'Amr - brother of Azd<sup>9</sup> - and the chief sub-divisions of Ghawth were Khath'am and Bajīla.<sup>10</sup> Khath'am inhabited the districts to the south of Ṭā'if, some of them settling in Tihāma and 'Asīr,<sup>11</sup> while others lived in the north of Ḥijāz. Al-Iṣfahānī mentions that they held an oasis called Maṭlūb somewhere between Medīna and Syria.<sup>12</sup> Yāqūt makes reference to a place called Walīya in the Khath'am area where Jarīr b. 'Abdallāh al-Bajalī destroyed the idol called Dhū al-Khalāṣa.<sup>13</sup> According to al-Bakrī, Khath'am settled

1. Mu'jam, III, 389.

2. Ibid., IV, 744.

3. Ibid., III, 259.

4. Ibid., IV, 418.

5. Ibid., IV, 442.

6. Qabā'il, p. 4.

7. Turfat, p. 63; Jamharat, p. 237.

8. 'Iqd, III, 386; Nuwayrī, II, 312.

9. Jamharat, p. 387.

10. Jamharat, p. 387; Inbāh, p. 101; bad', IV, 118; Ishtiqāq, p. 311. See for the wide disagreement on the Bajīla and Khath'am Jamharat, p. 387; Inbāh, p. 101; Tāj, VII, 222; Bakrī, I, 63; Watt, E.I.<sup>1</sup>, I, 865, S.v. [Bajīla].

11. Bakrī, I, 41, 57, 58.

12. Aghānī, XIII, 58.

13. Mu'jam, IV, 941, see Bakrī, IV, 508; Aṣnām, p. 36.



initially in the Sarāt mountains, but they were driven from there by Azd Shanū'a to a place between Bīsha and Turab, and it is from this time they allied themselves to the Qaḥṭānite group, having previously been associated with the 'Adnānites.<sup>1</sup> Bajīla inhabited 'Arwāt, a valley between Yemen and Najd,<sup>2</sup> and it was said to have originally been a single tribe. But as a result of wars with the Kalb, it became dispersed among other tribes<sup>3</sup> under whose protection it lived until Jarīr b. 'Abdallah al-Bajalī was able to reunite them during the Islamic period.<sup>4</sup> The most famous sub-divisions of Bajīla were Qasr and Jarm.<sup>5</sup>

Hamdān was another of the important Yemenite tribes apparently from the eastern regions with a genealogy which runs: Hamdān b. Mālik b. Zaid b. Awsala b. Rabī'a b. al-Khiyār b. Mālik b. Zaid b. Kahlān.<sup>6</sup> The Ḥāshid and Bakīl were the founders of Hamdān.<sup>7</sup>

The last section of Kahlān is Udad, with the genealogy: Udad b. Zaid b. Yashjub b. 'Arīb b. Zaid b. Kahlān, its chief sub-divisions were: Ṭayy, Ash'ar, Madhhij and Murra.<sup>8</sup> One account relates that Ṭayy left Yemen because they felt isolated here after the emigration of the Azd, and they went to Hijāz and settled in Samīrā' in the neighbourhood

---

1. Bakrī, I, 63.

2. Mu'jam, III, 638.

3. Naqā'id, II, 660; Jamharat, p. 360; see Aghānī, XI, 138.

4. Naqā'id, II, 660; Aghānī, XI, 138; Bakrī, I, 63; Jamharat, p. 387.

5. Qaḥṭān, p. 33; Bad', IV, 118.

6. Iklīl, VIII, 70; Sabā'ik, p. 32.

7. Iklīl, X, 28; Muntakhabāt, pp. 7, 53.

8. Turfat, p. 10; Lisān, VI, 84.

of Banū Asad, and then they took possession of the area.<sup>1</sup> Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥaqq locates their territories: "Ṭayy dwell in the mountain regions of Aja' and Sulma, eleven days ("ten nights") by foot from Faid and al-Quraiyāt in the direction of Syria; three mīl from Medīna; two days ("one night") from Fadak; and six days ("five nights") from Khaibar.<sup>2</sup> Others, however, extend their lands to the frontiers of Hīt.<sup>3</sup> Descended from Ṭayy are the Banū Nabhān and Banū Sudūs.<sup>4</sup>

The original home of Madhhiḡ was Najrān,<sup>5</sup> though Ibn Rusta places it in Saba'.<sup>6</sup> A section of them seem to have left the Yemen for the Hījāz.<sup>7</sup> The tribes of Sa'd-al-ʿAshīra, ʿAns, Jald and Murād are all held to derive from Madhhiḡ.<sup>8</sup> From Sa'd al-ʿAshīra arose Ju'fī,<sup>9</sup> whose territories in the Yemen were about forty-two farsakh from Ṣan'a'.<sup>10</sup> ʿAns settled in Yemen in land which al-Ya'qūbī locates as lying between Ḥalqain and Banū ʿĀmir on the route from Mecca.<sup>11</sup> From Jald b. Madhhiḡ comes Nakha',

1. Aghānī, X, 47; ʿIbar, II, 529; Muʿjam, I, 126-7.

2. Marāsid, I, 24.

3. Bakrī, I, 203.

4. Ishtiqāq, p. 394; ʿIqd, III, 349.

5. Ya'qūbī, I, 177; Bakrī, I, 40.

6. A'lāq, p. 133.

7. Bakrī, I, pp. 40, 90, 298.

8. Jamharat, p. 381; ʿIbar, II, 532.

9. ʿIqd, III, 393; Sabā'ik, p. 37.

10. Muʿjam, II, 88; IV, 439.

11. Buldān, p. 319. The stages he gives between Mecca and Tabāla are: Ḥard, Ḥalqain, ʿAns, Banū ʿĀmir, Maida'an, Hamlān, Dhī Jarra, Sarū, Duthaina, Kubaisa and Tabāla.

whose genealogy is Nakha' b. 'Amr b. 'Ulat b. Jald b. Madhhiḡ,<sup>1</sup> and who dwelt in the Yemen in a region called Bīsha.<sup>2</sup>

From Murra (another significant branch of Udad) come the two lines, al-Ḥārith and Ruhm.<sup>3</sup> The chief subdivisions of al-Ḥārith are: Khawlān b. 'Amr b. Mālīk b. al-Ḥārith, Judhām b. 'Adī b. al-Ḥārith, and Lakhm b. 'Adī b. al-Ḥārith.<sup>4</sup> Judhām appears to have left the Yemen at some earlier time and settled in Syria, and al-Bakrī mentions Madyan as one of their dwelling-places and Ma'īn as among their watering-places.<sup>5</sup> Ḥassān b. Thābit alludes to their regions held by them:<sup>6</sup>

ألم تَرَ أَنَّ الْعَذْرَ وَاللَّوْمَ وَالخَنَا  
بَنَى مَسْكَنًا بَيْنَ الْمُعَيْنِ إِلَى عُرْبٍ  
فَغَزَا فَاَلْمَرُوتَ فَالْحَبْتَ فَالْمَنَى إِلَى بَيْتِ زَمْرَاءَ تَلَدَا عَلَى تَلَدٍ  
Another section of Judhām occupied the area between Ayla

and Yanbu'.<sup>7</sup> From Judhām there comes Ghatafān.<sup>8</sup> Lakhm lived in Syria and 'Irāq, their region being identified by al-Hamdānī as al-Maghār;<sup>9</sup> and it was from 'Amam b. Numāra b. Lakhm that the kings of Hīra descended.<sup>10</sup> At times, Judhām and Lakhm are regarded as being the same.<sup>11</sup>

1. Jamharat, p. 414; Inbāh, p. 116; Qaḡṭān, p. 19; Ishtiqaq, p. 397.

2. Aghānī, IV, pp. 303-304.

3. Jamharat, p. 417.

4. Ishtiqaq, p. 380; 'Iqd, III, 404; Muntakhabāt, pp. 75-76.

5. Bakrī, IV, 1201.

6. Ḥassān, Dīwān, p. 82. See Bakrī, IV, 1247.

7. 'Ibar, II, 257.

8. Jamharat, p. 420; 'Iqd, III, 352.

9. Ṣifat, p. 130; See Lammens, E.I.<sup>1</sup>, III, 2. S.v. Lakhm.

10. Jamharat, p. 422; Ishtiqaq, p. 377.

11. Futūh, p. 140; Ṭabarī, III, 107; Bad', IV, 184.

### Kinda

The other major South Arabian tribal grouping was Kinda, the descent of which is given as: Kinda b. 'Ufair b. 'Adī b. al-Ḥārith b. Murra b. Udad.<sup>1</sup> They originated in the Yemen, from where they migrated to the Ḥaḍramawt;<sup>2</sup> later, certain sections moved northward to Syria<sup>3</sup> and al-Jazīra,<sup>4</sup> and Yāqūt mentions a region called Ṣandawdā', lying between 'Irāq and Syria, as belonging to them.<sup>5</sup> As branches of Kinda, we find Sakāsik b. Ashras b. Kinda and al-Sakūn,<sup>6</sup> and from the latter Tujaib traces its descent.<sup>7</sup>

### 'Adnānite Tribes

While all the tribes of this group derive their origins from 'Adnān, we have very little positive knowledge about this eponym. In Ṭabarī there is an account of an invasion of the Arab lands by Nebuchadnezzar in the reign of Ma'add b. 'Adnān;<sup>8</sup> but, as was pointed out by Jumahī, the name 'Adnān is not met with in pre-Islāmic poetry, and only rarely in the early literature of Islām.<sup>9</sup> Caskel interprets this to mean "that the name does not owe its place in the system to the conflict of parties in the Umayyad Period, like Nizār and Rabī'a, but is of Pre-

1. 'Iqd, III, 341; See, Krenkow, E.I.<sup>1</sup>, II, 1018, S.V. Kinda.

2. Ṣifat, p. 86; Iklīl, VIII, 110.

3. Ishtiqāq, p. 363; Mu'jam, III, 421.

4. Sam'ānī, p. 489.

5. Mu'jam, III, 421.

6. 'Iqd, III, 392.

7. Ishtiqāq, p. 371; 'Iqd, III, 322.

8. Ṭabarī, II, 27; Bräun, E.I.<sup>1</sup>, III, 58; S.V. Ma'add.

9. Jumahī, pp. 10-11.



Islāmic origin, although it does not spring from Bedouin tradition."<sup>1</sup> The tribes of 'Adnān settled in the region of Najd, and with the exception of Quraish,<sup>2</sup> all of them were nomadic.

'Adnān is sub-divided into Muḍar, Rabī'a, Iyād and Anmār, all of whom were sons of Nizār b. Ma'add; due to dissention among them, certain sections were forced to migrate from Najd and Tihāma.<sup>3</sup> From two sons of Muḍar, al-Yās and al-Nās, arise the groupings of Khindif and Qais 'Ailān respectively. Al-Yās is the ancestor of both Hudhail (b. Mudrika b. al-Yās) and Khuzaima.<sup>4</sup> In general, Hudhail is shown as occupying Tihāma<sup>5</sup> and the mountains of Sarāt;<sup>6</sup> among the places identified with them being: al-Ḍajan (a valley in Tihāma, two days distant from Mecca),<sup>7</sup> Dakhīl,<sup>8</sup> and al-'Arj (a town near Tā'if, regarded as the beginning of Tihāma).<sup>9</sup> Al-Wāqidī refers to Ḍajnān as a place about twenty-five mīl from Mecca belonging to Aslam, Hudhail and Ghāḍira;<sup>10</sup> while Ibn Khaldūn speaks of them in connection with places lying between Mecca and Medīna, such as al-Rajī' and the Ma'ūna well.<sup>11</sup>

1. Caskel, E.I.<sup>2</sup>, I, 210, S.V. 'Adnān.

2. 'Ibar, II, 298.

3. Bakrī, I, 19, 69.

4. 'Iqd, III, 337; 'Ibar, II, 662; Saba'ik, p. 22.

5. Bakrī, I, 88.

6. 'Ibar, II, 319.

7. Mu'jam, III, 466.

8. Ibid., IV, 789.

9. Ibid., III, 637; See E.I.<sup>1</sup>, II, 329, S.V. Hudhail.

10. Ibid., III, 465.

11. 'Ibar, II, 319.



From Khuzaima derive: al-Hawn, Kināna and Asad.<sup>1</sup>

The territories of al-Hawn are not specified in the sources, although occasionally reference is made to its branches, 'Adal and al-Qāra,<sup>2</sup> in Tihāma. At the time of the rise of Islam, Kināna is found in the regions around Mecca, bordering the lands of Hudhail in the south-west and of Asad to the north-east.<sup>3</sup> It is from Kināna that Quraish traces its origins: Quraish b. Fihir b. Mālik b. al-Nadr b. Kināna.<sup>4</sup>

Asad inhabited the vast region extending from Najd to Kūfa, and from there to Anbār.<sup>5</sup> From the indications offered by Yāqūt, they would seem to have enjoyed a relatively prosperous existence, holding such places as Rimth, Qaṭan, Ṭuraifa, Buzākha,<sup>6</sup> etc. In addition to these, we also find mentioned in connection with Asad the hills of Dhū Firgain<sup>7</sup> and the watering-place of Ghamr Marzūq.<sup>8</sup> Rabī'a b. Nizār had occupied an area extending over Tihāma, Ḥima and Yamāma,<sup>9</sup> with certain of its people settled, also, in 'Irāq and al-Jazīra.<sup>10</sup> 'Anaza b. Asad

1. Jamharat, p. 190.

2. Jamharat, p. 190; Inbāh, p. 73.

3. 'Ibar, II, 320; E.I.<sup>1</sup>, II, 1017, S.v. Kināna.

4. Zubairī, p. 10; Sabā'ik, p. 62.

5. Mu'jam, II, 91; IV, 170; 'Ibar, II, 622.

6. Mu'jam, II, 816; IV, 139; III, 536; I, 601.

7. Ḥamāsa, I, 289; Mu'jam, III, 882.

8. Khalīfa, I, 80.

9. Bakrī, II, pp. 568-569.

10. 'Ibar, II, 300.

b. Rabī'a migrated to 'Irāq where he settled at 'Ayn al-Tamr, later moving to Khaibar;<sup>1</sup> while other members of the tribe passed on to the region of Rakiyat Luqmān in Bahrain.<sup>2</sup>

Also from Rabī'a descended the important group of 'Abd al-Qais (b. Jadīla b. Asad b. Rabī'a),<sup>3</sup> which left Tihāma and went to Bahrain, displacing the Iyād and driving them into 'Irāq.<sup>4</sup> Another group of 'Abd al-Qais is said to have gone to Qatīf, where they had places under their control such as Khaṭ and 'Ainān.<sup>5</sup> Most of the clans of 'Abd al-Qais claim descent from Lukaiz b. Afṣā b. 'Abd al-Qais.<sup>6</sup> Thus, Muḥarib b. 'Amr b. Wadī'a b. Lukaiz lived in Maghīthat al-Mawān, a place between Mecca and Medīna;<sup>7</sup> while his brother Dīl<sup>8</sup> is spoken of as being in Tihāma.<sup>9</sup> Also from 'Amr b. Wadī'a was descended the Banū Dhul.<sup>10</sup> Two other large groups of Rabī'a were Taghlib and Bakr, the sons of Wā'il b. Qāsiṭ b. Hanb (brother of 'Abd al-Qais) b. Afṣā b. Du'mī b. Jadīla b. Asad b. Rabī'a.<sup>11</sup>

---

1. 'Ibar, II, 300.

2. Mu'jam, II, 811.

3. Jamharat, p. 300; Nūwayrī, II, 329.

4. Bakrī, I, 80; Aghānī, XIII, 56, XV, 44; 'Ibar, II, 300; Mu'jam, III, 541.

5. Bakrī, I, 81; Mu'jam, II, 454; III, pp. 36, 1541, 755, IV, pp. 38, 39, 359, 514.

6. Jamharat, p. 469; see Ishtiqāq, p. 324; Nūwayrī, II, 329.

7. Buldān, p. 312.

8. Jamharat, p. 469; Lisān, XIII, 270.

9. Mu'jam, IV, 424.

10. Jamharat, p. 297.

11. Jamharat, pp. 300-302; Nūwayrī, II, 329; Lisān, VII, 95.

Originally Taghhib lived with the other tribes of Rabī'a in Najd, Hijāz and Tihāma, but as a result of tribal feuding<sup>1</sup> it was obliged to migrate to al-Jazīra al-Furātīya (between the lands at Bakr and Qudā'a),<sup>2</sup> centering in particular around Sinjār and Naṣībīn, which became known as Dīyār Rabī'a.<sup>3</sup> Al-Bakrī makes the interesting suggestion that their migration from Tihāma was due to drought, as well as to tribal feuding.<sup>4</sup> According to al-Hamdānī they occupied the area extending between Yamāma and Bahrain, between Sīf and Kāzima, and thence to the Sawād, Ubilla up to Hīt.<sup>5</sup>

From Bakr descend Yashkur and 'Alī,<sup>6</sup> the latter being the progenitor of the Banū Ḥanīfa, who were settled in Yamāma,<sup>7</sup> as well as the Banū Shaibān<sup>8</sup> who occupied the region from Yamāma to Baṣra,<sup>9</sup> with some branches settled to the east of the Tigris near Mouṣil.<sup>10</sup> The Banū Sadūs in Yamāma,<sup>11</sup> is given a descent from Shaibān.<sup>12</sup> The last branch of 'Abd al-Qais is the Namir b. Qāsiṭ which was at

---

1. Bakrī, I, 86.

2. Ṣifat, p. 170; Bakrī, IV, pp. 1175-1176.

3. 'Ibar, II, 302.

4. Bakrī, III, pp. 1042-1043; See, Ṣifat, p.163; Aghānī, XI, 42; Mu'jam, II, 209.

5. Ṣifat, p. 169; See, Bakrī, I, 86.

6. Jamharat, p. 309; Ishtiqāq, p. 344; Inbāh, p. 97.

7. Dīnawarī, p. 18; Bakrī, I, pp. 83-84; 'Ibar, II, 302.

8. Jamharat, p. 317.

9. 'Ibar, II, 302.

10. Ibid., II, 303.

11. Mu'jam, IV, 85.

12. Ishtiqāq, p. 211; Lisān, VII, 410.

first located in Yamāma,<sup>1</sup> but later moved to al-Jazīra and occupied the western district of Takrīt.<sup>2</sup>

### Qais

The other son of Muḍar was al-Nās, called also 'Ailān<sup>3</sup> or Qais 'Ailān.<sup>4</sup> The tribe at Qais was for the most part located in Tihāma, especially the districts near Medīna, with some of them living in Medīna itself,<sup>5</sup> and in the 'Āliya.<sup>6</sup> The market of 'Ukāḍ was in the middle of their lands.<sup>7</sup> According to al-Bakrī, Qais moved from Tihāma to the Najd as a result of feuds with Khindif; and some went further on to Sinjār in 'Irāq.<sup>8</sup>

The largest branch of Qais was Ghatafān,<sup>9</sup> who occupied the area extending from Ḥunain to the north of Medīna and the lands of Ṭayy.<sup>10</sup> From Ghatafān comes Ashja', who were settled in Medīna,<sup>11</sup> as well as 'Abs and Dhubiān, who were living to the east of the city. Lughda mentions Ghabāwa and Jafr in the Wādī al-Rumma as belonging to them.<sup>12</sup> Fazāra, too, traces its descent from Ghatafān,

1. Mu'jam, III, 709.

2. Ibid., II, 373.

3. Lisān, VIII, 71; See Ṣihāḥ, II, 975.

4. Inbāḥ, p. 81; For the origin of the name, Qais 'Ailān, cf. Ishtiqaq, p. 162; Ḥamāsa, I, 125.

5. Buldān, p. 312.

6. Aghānī, XV, 347.

7. Iklīl, VIII, 184.

8. Bakrī, I, 87; II, 562.

9. Jamharat, p. 243; Ishtiqaq, p. 269; 'Ibar, II, 305.

10. Mu'jam, III, 561, IV, 561.

11. 'Ibar, II, 305.

12. Lughda, f. 10.



with the genealogy: Fazāra b. Dhubiān b. Baghīd b. al-Raith b. Ghatafān.<sup>1</sup> Fazāra were found in the Wādī al-Qurā,<sup>2</sup> where Yāqūt mentions Ghaḍwar,<sup>3</sup> Yara'a<sup>4</sup> and 'Abāqir<sup>5</sup> as belonging to them. The two mountains of Ḥarsain, were also in the lands of Fazāra.<sup>6</sup>

Other branches descended from Qais, through his son Sa'd are: Bāhila b. A'ṣur b. Sa'd b. Qais,<sup>7</sup> which settled in Yamāma,<sup>8</sup> and Ghanī b. A'ṣur b. Sa'd b. Qais, which settled in Najd.<sup>9</sup>

From Khaṣafa b. Qais come Salāmān and Sulaim,<sup>10</sup> both of whom settled in the region of Medīna and Wādī al-'Aqīq,<sup>11</sup> and Hawāzin. The Hawāzin was scattered throughout Najd and the eastern Ḥijāz around Mecca,<sup>12</sup> their lands including part of Tihāma, Bīsha, Ta'if, Dhā al-Majāz, Hunain and Awṭās.<sup>13</sup> From Hawāzin the important clan of Thaqīf,<sup>14</sup> settled in Ta'if,<sup>15</sup> and also that of 'Āmir b.

1. Jamharat, p. 249; Ishtiqāq, p. 272; Tāj, I, 626.

2. Ṭabarī, III, 83.

3. Mu'jam, I, 585.

4. Ibid., IV, 1014.

5. Ibid., III, 602, 656.

6. Hamāsa, I, 228.

7. Jamharat, p. 244.

8. Mu'jam, III, 628.

9. Ibid., IV, 212, 232, S.1; Lughda, f. 16.

10. Jamharat, p. 260; Nuwayrī, II, pp. 334-5.

11. Buldān, p. 313.

12. E.I.<sup>1</sup>, II, 293. S.V. Hawāzin.

13. Bakrī, I, 87.

14. 'Ibar, II, 639; Lisān, X, 363.

15. 'Ibar, II, 640.



Ṣa'ṣa'a b. Mu'āwiya b. Bakr,<sup>1</sup> which occupied the area from eastern Medīna to the Najd border.<sup>2</sup> From 'Āmir b. Ṣa'ṣa'a came Banū Numair, settled partly in Najd and partly in Yamāma; Banū Hilāl, whose territories lay between Mecca and Baṣra, or, as some say, between Mecca and Medīna;<sup>3</sup> Banū 'Uqail, settled in Najd;<sup>4</sup> and Banū Qushair and Banū Ja'da settled in Wādī 'Inān (in the lands of Banū 'Āmir), Ja'da holding its northern part while Qushair held the southern.<sup>5</sup>

From Banū 'Uqail, were descended al-Muntafiq,<sup>6</sup> which was settled in 'Irāq between Baṣra and Kūfa,<sup>7</sup> and Khafāja, living in 'Irāq and of Jazīra.<sup>8</sup> Other clans of the 'Āmir b. Ṣa'ṣa'a line are: Kilāb,<sup>9</sup> settled in Najd,<sup>10</sup> and Ka'b, probably dwelling in the same region. 'Amr b. Qais has two branches: Fahm and 'Adwān, settled in Ṭā'if originally, but moving from here to Tihāma after the arrival of Thaḳīf.<sup>11</sup>

### Tamīm

This tribe is the last major branch of Muḍar descended from Udd b. Ṭābikha b. al-Yās b. Muḍar. The most

1. Jamharat, p. 269; 'Ibar, II, 310.
2. Tabaqāt, II, i, 37; Ṭabarī, III, 34.
3. Mu'jam, IV, 479; Wüstenfeld, p. 84.
4. Ḥamāsa, I, 415; Mu'jam, IV, 157.
5. Mu'jam, III, 734, IV, 157.
6. Jamharat, p. 290.
7. 'Ibar, II, 647.
8. Jamharat, p. 291; 'Ibar, II, 648.
9. Jamharat, p. 288; see Ishtiqāq, p. 178.
10. Mu'jam, III, 706; Lughda, f. 12.
11. Jamharat, p. 243.

important sub-divisions of Udd are Dabba and Murr.<sup>1</sup> Dabba lived in Yamāma, where Yāqūt mentions two oases as belonging to them: Sillā<sup>2</sup> and Bakra.<sup>3</sup> Some, too, lived in Najd,<sup>4</sup> while others were found in Dahnā'.<sup>5</sup> From Murr comes Tamīm, the largest tribe of Muḍar,<sup>6</sup> occupying extensive territories from Najd and Yamāma to Ḥajar in Bahrain.<sup>7</sup> The major important divisions of Tamīm are: Banū al-ʿAnbar, settled in Yamāma,<sup>8</sup> Dahnā' and Dhāt al-Shuqūq,<sup>9</sup> al-Ḥabiṭāt and Banū Ḥanzala.<sup>10</sup> Ḥanzala is sub-divided into Barājim, Mujāshi' and Nahshal.<sup>11</sup>

It will be apparent from this description of the genealogies of the tribes and their distribution throughout the Arabian Peninsula, Syria and ʿIrāq, that no concern for probability or even self-consistency was felt by the historians who treated the subject. Disregard for the chronology of the settlement of the various regions they ascribe to one or another of the tribes would indicate that they, too, felt that the information at their disposal was largely fictitious - because the dating of events is the

---

1. Jamharat, p. 198.

2. Muʿjam, III, 109.

3. Ibid., I, 705.

4. Ibid., IV, 672.

5. Ibid., IV, 424.

6. Jamharat, pp. 206-7.

7. Bakrī, I, 88.

8. Muʿjam, III, 910.

9. Bakrī, II, 806.

10. Jamharat, p. 207; ʿIqd, III, 345.

11. Naqāʿiḍ, I, 53; Jamharat, p. 222; Ṣiḥāḥ, V, 1918.

central purpose of history as they conceived it. Thus, a region such as Ṭihāma, Najd and Yamāma would have been swarming with tribal groups of the most diverse and antipathetic origins if all the settlements mentioned in the sources actually occurred, and the economic resources of the region, in terms of the number of oases, would never have sustained even a small portion of all the tribes purported to live there.

However, there was an important purpose underlying this attempt by the genealogists to give a descent and location to the men of tribal background who figured in the political life of their own periods. This was, in effect, an assertion of the nobility of such men within a society of parvenues, and the patent of their rights to leadership. It was the Arab who had preached Islām throughout the world, and whosoever could claim descent from this race was, by this very fact, pre-eminent among men. The converts to Islām were often Mawālī who assimilated to their own names the names of the tribal group or families to which they were clients, and it was felt important that they should not be allowed to usurp their distinction, too, as they had so much else.

## CHAPTER II

THE CONQUESTS AND TRIBAL MIGRATION

The expansion of the Arabs out of their Peninsula into the civilized regions of the north coincided with the exhaustion of the Byzantine and Sāsānid Empires as a result of years of profitless war. With Islām serving as a solvent for their natural disunity, the Arabs were at last of a strength capable of testing the defences of their northern neighbours, and when these were found to be weak, continuous attacks were mounted against them under which they finally collapsed.

It would probably be an over simplification to regard the campaigns of Mu'ta<sup>1</sup> in the year 9/630, and Usāma<sup>2</sup> of 11/632 as attempts to capture 'Irāq and Syria, but a new situation arose after the death of the Prophet which was to give a fresh impetus to activities in this direction. During the caliphate of Abū Bakr (11/632 - 13/634) the problem which most immediately confronted the young state was the revolt of the formerly submissive tribes against Medīna, known in history as the Ridda;<sup>3</sup>

---

1. Sīra, III, 427.

2. Ibid., IV, 327.

3. Futūh, pp. 103-115.



but after this had been suppressed and peace restored, Medīna was faced with the serious problem of providing objectives for the large number of troops it had amassed, and which were a potential source of trouble if left in idleness. 'Irāq and Syria were attractive areas for further operations, and in addition to the Medīnese troops who were sent thither,<sup>1</sup> Abū Bakr later used the occasion to rid the Peninsula of those tribes that had fought against the Muslims by allowing them, too, to assist in the campaigns.

At first, however, he seemed reluctant to have these former enemies in the Medīnese army, and in a letter to the 'ummāl al-ridda he enjoined them never to seek the help of an apostate (murrtad) in fighting their enemies.<sup>2</sup> In a subsequent letter he modifies this position by saying that only former apostates of whom he approved could be so employed,<sup>3</sup> indicating that the scope of the campaigns was beginning to exceed early expectations and needed this additional manpower. That the wealth of Syria and 'Irāq attracted the Arabs is clearly attested in the address delivered by Khālīd b. al-Walīd to his

---

1. Wāqidī, I, 41.

2. Tabarī, III, 276.

3. Ibid, IV, 4.

troops after the battle of Salāsil: "Do you not see food in abundance? Even though our efforts are in the cause of God, yet would we have still fought for our sustenance because of our poverty".<sup>1</sup> Conversations between al-Mughīra b. Shu'ba and the Persian leaders were in the same vein when he explained that it was the poverty of the Arabian Peninsula which spurred the Arabs to invade the fruitful regions of the north.<sup>2</sup> Al-Balādhurī records that Abū Bakr wrote letters to all quarters, persuading the tribes to join the armies of Islām by describing the rich booty that was to be taken from the Byzantines; and the historians mention that not all those who participated in the campaigns were motivated by thoughts of reward in the hereafter.<sup>3</sup>

The economic factors which influenced the expansion of the Arabs to leave the Peninsula were certainly as strong as the religious zeal of their leaders, though, of course, = later historians chose to stress the latter as the primary motive force.<sup>4</sup> Alongside such heroes of the Holy War as al-Nu'mān b. Mugarrin, who figured conspicuously at the

---

1. Ṭabarī, IV, 9.

2. Kharāj, p. 33; Dīnawarī, p. 121.

3. Futūḥ, p. 128.

4. Muqaddima, p. 151.

battle of Nihāwand,<sup>1</sup> there must have been the other more secular leaders who, for instance, made no effort to stimulate conversion in the treaties they drew up with the conquered peoples.

In many respects the expansion was really a migration of the tribes to the more prosperous regions of the north, and they came there as tribes under the rule of their own Shaikhs rather than as contingents in the army of Islām. The dīwān of ʿOmar gives the erroneous impression of a coherent military establishment, the existence of which would have been utterly impossible in the conditions of the time.

Long before the birth of Islām, tribes from the Peninsula had migrated into Syria,<sup>2</sup> and it was their presence here that made the area familiar to those who came with the invasions. Al-Wāqidī mentions that, in response to the appeal of Abū Bakr, the tribes of Ḥimyar, Madhḥij, Ṭayy, Azd, Kināna, Kilāb, Hawāzin and Thaḳīf joined in the conquest of Syria,<sup>3</sup> and Ṭabarī records that most Arabs preferred this region to ʿIrāq. The Caliph ʿOmar asked Kināna and Azd which land they wanted to occupy, and both answered, Shām, the home of our ancestors for generations.<sup>4</sup> In the army of Khālīd b. al-Walīd at

---

1. Futūḥ, p. 300. He refused to act as a collector of spoils (jābī), and chose to remain merely a (ghāzī).

2. Muʿjam, II, 72.

3. Wāqidī, I, 3.

4. Ṭabarī, IV, pp. 72-73.

the battle of Yarmūk the tribesmen of Lakhm and Judhām were represented,<sup>1</sup> both of whom could claim long association with the region; indeed, it was only after the conquest that Qais was to come here.<sup>2</sup>

The tribal division of Syria as given by Ya'qūbī shows a predominance of Yemenī stock: the ancient city of Ḥamāt was held by Bahrā' and Tanūkh; Ḥumṣ by Ṭayy, Kinda, Ḥimyar, Kalb and Hamdān; Shaizar and Uṭum, for the most part, by Kinda; and Jabala by Hamdān and Qais.<sup>3</sup>

#### The Tribes and the Umayyad Caliphs

The Umayyad dynasty came into being only with the consent of the tribes of Syria<sup>4</sup> and it survived because the foundations laid by Mu'āwīya b. Abī Sufyān (40/660 - 60/679) were in accordance with the mentality of the Bedouin which he so well understood.<sup>5</sup> The sources dwell on ~~the~~ tact (ḥilm) he used in dealing with the tribal chiefs,<sup>6</sup> and he, also, made use of the revenues of the state

---

1. Wāqidī, I, 9.

2. Futūḥ, p. 178.

3. Buldān, pp. 324-327. In locating these tribes in cites, Ya'qūbī, of course, means the regions of which these were the centres.

4. Ṭabarī, VI, 172; Murūj, III, 95.

5. Mubarrad, I, 311.

6. Mubarrad, Kāmil, I, 61, relates that on one occasion Aḥnaf b. Qais and certain individuals of the Sa'd of Tamīm, used insulting words to Mu'āwīya. When his daughter asked

(Contd.)



to purchase their loyalty and support.<sup>1</sup> It was this favourable disposition of the local tribes that was his most important and valuable legacy to his son and successor, Yazīd. While he was still alive we hear of an Azdite who declared in <sup>his</sup> Presence, "You are Amīr al-Mu'minīn, and if you die Yazīd will succeed you. If any one tries to prevent it he will receive this, - indicating his sword."<sup>2</sup>

However, neither Ashja'<sup>3</sup> nor Aslam<sup>4</sup> recognized the accession of Yazīd; and even when he was still merely his father's nominee for the succession, Qais refused him the (bay'a), saying: "By God, we shall not pay homage to

---

Contd.) why he tolerated this, he replied, "Muḍar is the backbone of the Arabs, Tamīm is the backbone of Muḍar, and Sa'd is the backbone of Tamīm. These men are from Sa'd."

In another incident (Kāmil, I, 311), Mu'āwiya is said to have accused a Bedouin of lying; when the latter replied that it was Mu'āwiya himself who was the liar, he placated him by pretending that he had spoken in haste.

1. For example, he paid Aḥnaf b. Qais, Jāriya b. Qudāma, Jawn al-'Abshamī and al-Ḥutāt b. Yazīd - all chiefs of Tamīm - one hundred thousand dirhams each. Ṭabarī, VI, 135.
2. Murūj, III, 37; See Kūfī, I, f.307.
3. Ṭabaqāt, IV, 11, 24.
4. Ansāb, V, 87.

the son of a Kalbite woman".<sup>1</sup> It is from his time, we are told, that the hostility between Qais and the Umayyads began. Although in the early period of the dynasty Mu'āwīya had made particular efforts to retain the support of Muḍar, as they grew weak and the Yemenīs strong, it was with the latter that he saw his interests best served.<sup>2</sup>

During the reign of Mu'āwīya and Yazīd, there was a state of comparative harmony among the tribes in Syria. However, the region was then under menace from both 'Irāq and the Hijāz, and it was but self-interest that dictated that they should remain united and present a solid front. Moreover, sufficient revenues were flowing into the country from the young empire to assure that each could enjoy a prosperity hitherto unknown.<sup>3</sup> However, after the death at Yazīd in 64/683 and the abdication of his son Mu'āwīya II a month or so after his accession, the problem as to who should receive the rôle of Amīr al-Mu'minīn set the tribes against one another. 'Abdallāh b. al-Zubair in the Hijāz saw himself as a possible claimant and in this he enjoyed the support of Zufar b. al-Hārith the leader of the Qais in Syria.<sup>4</sup> However, most

---

1. Ḥamāsa, I, 319.

2. Aghānī, XVIII, pp. 69-70; Kūfī, I, f. 317.

3. 'Asākir, I, 108.

4. Muḥabbar, p. 255; Aghānī, XIV, 242.

of the tribes in Syria, which were of Yemenī origin - Kalb, Sakāsik, Sakūn, Tayy, Ghassān, Tanūkh<sup>1</sup> and 'Udhra<sup>2</sup> - supported the claim of the Umayyad, Marwān b. al-Hakam, and they had the support of a few tribes of northern descent, too, notably, Taghlib<sup>3</sup> and Muḥārib.<sup>4</sup> The victory of Kalb over Qais in the battle of Marj Rāhiṭ in 64/683 established Marwān on the throne, but it had the negative effect of making it henceforth impossible for the two confederations to co-operate in any venture or to forget their differences for the sake of political ideals or purposes.<sup>5</sup> In the battle no fewer than eighty of the most eminent chiefs - who were receiving the sharaf al-'aṭā' - were slain.<sup>6</sup>

Later 'Abd al-Malik b. Marwān (65/684 - 86/705) tried to re-unite the tribes by a policy of reconciliation,<sup>7</sup>

---

1. Ḥamāsa, I, 317; Ansāb, V, 138; Murūj, III, 96; Kāmil, IV, 63.

2. Aghānī, XVII, 112.

3. Ansāb, V, pp. 308, 314.

4. Tabarī, VII, 4.

5. Ansāb, V, 157. The verses quoted here show how deep and bitter was the cleavage between the two after this battle.

6. 'Iqd, IV, 397. The status of a chief was indicated by the size of the stipend he received from the treasury - the maximum amount being described as sharaf al-'aṭā'.

7. Tabarī, VII, 189. He seems to have tried to achieve this by marriage alliances, for two of his sons, al-Walīd and Sulaimān, were born of Qaisite women. Kāmil, V, 41.

but he lacked the skill of Mu'āwiya which might have been able to bring this about, and the hostility felt towards him by Mudar and Qais was, if anything, even deeper, both of them openly siding with Ibn al-Zubair.<sup>1</sup>

He even managed to lose the enthusiastic support of the Kalb in Syria by this show of impartiality.<sup>2</sup> Probably, he did not want to place himself under too great an obligation to them and allow the impression that his survival as head of state was in their hands.

The situation changes during the reign of his sons al-Walīd (86/705 - 96/714) and Sulaimān (96/714 - 99/717), both of whom had Qaisite mothers.<sup>3</sup> While al-Walīd was wholly committed to Qais and favoured its tribes above all others, Sulaimān was more ambivalent in his attitudes. Qais still retained its dominant position in the kingdom, and Tamīm was allowed a prominent place in affairs, but he also fostered good relations with the tribes of

- 
1. Aghānī, VIII, 66; Jumahī, Ṭabaqāt, pp. 357, 437, reports that 'Abd al-Malik would not allow Qaisite poets into his court, because they all supported Ibn al-Zubair.
  2. Ḥamāsa, I, 437.
  3. Ansāb, V, 311. Walīd's mother was from the tribe of 'Abs, while Sulaimān was raised by his uncles of the same tribe. Naqā'id, I, 384; Bad', VI, 4; Aghānī, XI, 90.



southern origin. Thus, important preferments were given to men of Sakāsik,<sup>1</sup> and his relations with Muhallabites of Azd were especially close. Because of his connections with the Banū Arqam,<sup>2</sup> he was on good terms with Kinda, also.

In his pre-occupation with the religious aspects of sovereignty, ‘Omar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz (99/717 - 101/719) broke with familiar Umayyad practices in his dealings with the tribes. The individuals in whom he confided, and the ones who received privileges, were usually men of piety and good life, and little regard was paid to their tribal associations. It is difficult, therefore, to see a pattern in the fluctuating fortunes of the various groups in this short reign, but with the accession of Yazīd b. ‘Abd al-Malik (101/719 - 105/723) we return again to the former policies, and find him basing his rule on Qais, which resulted directly from his marriage into the Banū Murra from the same tribe.<sup>3</sup>

Hishām b. ‘Abd al-Malik (105/723 - 125/742) was unable to control the tribal feuding which, by now, was threatening the very existence of the state. He depended

- 
1. For example, Yazīd b. Abī Kabsha was appointed governor of Sind in 96/714. Futūḥ, p. 428.
  2. For instance, Sulaimān appointed ‘Adī b. ‘Adī a governor of Jazīra, Arminiya and Adharbaijān. Jamharat, p. 427.
  3. Aghānī, XII, pp. 63, 264.

for his support on the Banū Makhzūm, the tribe of his mother, to the exclusion of the other branches of Quraish,<sup>1</sup> and this would appear to be the only concession he made to tribal alignments. He was on particularly bad terms with Rabī'a,<sup>2</sup> Thaqīf<sup>3</sup> and Yemen,<sup>4</sup> the first two of northern and the last of southern origin.

His successor, al-Walīd b. Yazīd (125/742 - 126/743), also, relied on Qais, despite the fact that the tribes of the south were predominant in Damascus. But events now took on a more sinister aspect for the destiny of the state, for members of the Umayyad family tried to exploit these tribal antagonisms in pursuance of their own ambitions. Thus, we find Yazīd b. al-Walīd leading Qudā'a and Sakūn in a rebellion against his cousin the Caliph, killing him and seizing control for himself;<sup>5</sup> in response to which, Marwān b. Muḥammad (127/744 - 132/749), at the head of Muḍar, Qais and Kināna, in his turn rebelled and seized power.<sup>6</sup>

It is generally accepted by contemporary Islāmic historians that the collapse of the Umayyad state is

---

1. Ishtiqāq, p. 82.

2. Ṭabarī, VIII, 258; See Dīnawarī, p. 327.

3. Ya'qūbī, III, 74.

4. Ya'qūbī, III, 69; Jumahī, p. 298.

5. Ṭabarī, IX, 3; Aghānī, VII, pp. 80, 83.

6. Dīnawarī, p. 334.

uniquely attributable to the inability of its rulers to establish a policy towards the tribes which <sup>allow</sup> ~~would~~ them to co-operate within the new order which they themselves had brought into being. For, in fact, they did not regard it as a new order, but rather as a projection of the attitudes and practices of the Peninsula into a region where the rewards for dominating their old rivals were greater than ever before. That this situation was allowed to persist, and even encouraged, by members of the Umayyad house in their ambitions for power, is indicative of how oblivious of these stresses within the state those charged with its direction had become. It is in the provinces, rather than in Syria, that one can see the inadequacy of the system of government - a legacy of the desert tribal council - by which the Umayyad Caliphate sought to control the Empire.

#### The Conquest of 'Irāq and the Settlement of the Tribes

The condition of those tribes who emigrated into 'Irāq in the course of the Conquests was significantly different from those who located themselves in Syria, a difference that presents itself in the first instance in the very nature of the regions. Under the Sāsānids very few urban centres developed, and in 'Irāq, in particular, the lack of a city culture deprived the indigenous Arab tribes of the civilizing influences which the tribes of Syria, with its numerous great cities, had for long enjoyed.



When, as Muslims, they penetrated into the latter region they were immediately subjected to all the imperceptible restraints that life there would impose upon them; whereas in 'Irāq they could lead the same kind of life they had previously known, but in more congenial natural conditions. In Syria, no new cities were built to accommodate the newcomers,<sup>1</sup> and it can be assumed that those already in existence were permitted to exercise their influence over these as they had over the tribes already present there; but in 'Irāq, one of the first problems to present itself was the construction of centres where the tribes flowing into the area could accommodate themselves in sufficient numbers to present a strong military presence to the indigenous inhabitants. It would be wrong to regard these camps (amṣār) as being established on the model of any existing cities in the area, and it was only with the passage of time and the influx of a diversified population that they assume the features of urban settlement. The Arabs who migrated into these centres brought with them the mentality and attitudes of their desert background which was, if anything, hostile and destructive to all that urban life implied.

---

1. Futūḥ, pp. 129, 341.



Khālīd b. al-Walīd at the head of an army of ten thousand warriors, crossed into the Sawād in the year 12/633, reaching Ubilla, which was to be the site of the city of Baṣra.<sup>1</sup> Two thousand of these troops had accompanied him from Medīna since the beginning of his campaign, while the other eight thousand were men from Rabīʿa and Muḍar, who joined in the course of his advance across the Peninsula. Shortly after his arrival in ʿIrāq a further eight thousand, among whom only the name of the Banū Shaibān is mentioned, augmented this army, with which Khālīd attacked and routed the Persian troops under the command of Hurmuz in the vicinity of Ḥīra.<sup>2</sup>

The expedition was of the nature of a reconnaissance, and a testing of the defenses of the Sāsānids. In the Caliphate of Abū Bakr, one of the leaders of the Banū Shaibān, a certain Muthannā b. Ḥāritha, received a promise that the Muslims would assist him in his raids into southern ʿIrāq<sup>3</sup>, and Khālīd's campaign is mentioned as the

- 
1. Ṭabarī, III, 356. According to Wāqidī, however, Khālīd did not proceed on to Baṣra, at this time. After subjecting Yamāma and Baḥrain, he returned to Medīna; and it was from there that he set out for ʿIrāq, following the route of Faīd and Thaʿlabiyya to Ḥīra. Futūḥ, p. 336.
  2. Ṭabarī, IV, pp. 4-5.
  3. Wāqidī, Futūḥ al-ʿIrāq, I, f.7.

honouring of this Promise.<sup>1</sup> In fact, however, it proved to be the beginning of a movement of migration and settlement.

Although Khālīd was soon to leave here for Syria, the Caliph 'Omar continued to supply reinforcements to the troops he had left there; but these were not nearly so numerous as the other Arabs who moved into the area seeking new lands in which to live, rather than as military conquerors. This lack of warlike spirit may explain why the second engagement fought against the Sāsānids at Jisr in 13/634 ended in defeat for the Muslims,<sup>2</sup> though more probably the blame is to be laid on 'Omar for putting at the head of the army Abū 'Ubaid b. Mas'ūd al-Thaqafī instead of the experienced local chief, al-Muthanna b. Hāritha.<sup>3</sup>

This defeat at Jisr came as a shock to the leaders in Medīna, for, indeed, in this single battle most of the Muslim army was lost, and the only way they could redeem this loss was to mobilize the tribes of Peninsula into a

- 
1. Futūḥ, p.242. Ṭabarī, III, 444 reports from Saif that Khālīd had received instructions from Abū Bakr to enter 'Irāq at its southernmost part and proceed northwards, which would apparently imply that the conquest of the whole region was contemplated from the earliest days of the campaigns.
  2. Wāqidī, Futūḥ al-'Irāq, I, f.4; Ṭabarī, III, 454.
  3. Futūḥ, p. 129. Abū 'Ubaid was blamed for attacking the Persians with inadequate forces, instead of waiting for reinforcements from the Caliph.

new force. The greatest response to this appeal for fighting men came from Bajīla, which supplied fully a quarter of the new recruits; and by virtue of this numerical superiority,<sup>1</sup> one of their chiefs, Jarīr b. ‘Abdallāh al-Bajalī, was given the leadership of this contingent. Because of the readiness of their response, Bajīla was, also, promised a quarter of whatever lands should be conquered in the Sawād. However, shortly afterwards, ‘Omar appointed Sa‘d b. Abī Waqqās to the command of all the troops in ‘Iraq, assigning two thousand Yemenī soldiers and a further two thousand Najdīs to his personal command.<sup>2</sup>

To the troops Sa‘d now had at his disposal in ‘Irāq there came a further three thousand men from Tamīm, another thousand from Ribāb, and three thousand from Asad;

- 
1. The other tribes which contributed troops, according to the various sources, were: Azd, Tamīm, Ṭayy, Ḍabba and Namir b. Qāsiṭ, (Dīnawarī, p. 114); Ribāb, Jusham, Khath‘am, and Taghlib (Ṭabarī, IV, 73); Banū ‘Ijil (Futūḥ, p. 242); Madhḥij, Ṣudā’, and Qais (Kāmil, II, 189). All the sources are agreed that the greatest response came from Bajīla, but apart from this, their information about the composition of this new army is highly selective. What is clear, however, is that all the tribes mentioned were soon to become prominent in the conquests, whether or not they formed the army collected by ‘Omar.
  2. Futūḥ, pp. 253, 267; from where it is repeated in Ṭabarī, IV, pp. 71-72, and Murūj, II, 318.

to which, of course should be added the survivors of the army (mainly from Rabī'a and Bakr) of al-Muthanna b. Ḥāritha.<sup>1</sup> It seems clear that Medīna wished to keep the control of the invasion of this region in its own hands, rather than allowing it to become a tribal enterprise; and it was for this reason that men such as Abū 'Ubaid, Jarīr and Sa'd were placed in command of the armies rather than men of greater local experience.

At the battle of Qādisīya (14/635), those Arab troops were said to number thirty thousand.<sup>2</sup> At about the same time as this engagement, the southern regions of 'Irāq were being overrun by the tribe of Bakr, led by Qutba b. Qatāda al-Dhuhlī;<sup>3</sup> and Medīna asserted its authority here, also, by sending a contingent under 'Utba b. Ghazwān to participate in these conquests. It was 'Utba who founded the city of Baṣra in the year 14/635.<sup>4</sup> After the victory of Qadisiya, Sa'd was left

- 
1. Ṭabarī, IV, 86; Dīnawarī, p. 119. It would appear that these new contingents from Tamīm and Rībāb were additional to those which had earlier joined the army of Jarīr.
  2. Ṭabarī, IV, 87. According to Abū Wa'il, the army was only about seven or eight thousand! Cf. Khalīfa, I, 119.
  3. Futūḥ, p. 335.
  4. Kāmil, II, 223.



the most powerful military leader in the region,<sup>1</sup> and he is said to have founded Kūfa in the year 17/636.<sup>2</sup>

### Kūfa and the Settlement of the Tribes

On the instructions of 'Omar b. al-Khaṭṭāb, Sa'd distributed the lands in the vicinity of Kūfa among the tribes.<sup>3</sup> Among those that acquired land at this time were: Sulaim, Thaqīf, Hamdān, Bajīla, Taim al-Lāt, Taghlib, Asad, Nakha', Kinda, Azd, Muzaina, Tamīm, Muḥārib, 'Āmir, Jadīla, Juhaina.<sup>4</sup> To this list Ya'qūbī adds 'Abs, Qais, Bakr, Ṭayy and Ashja'.<sup>5</sup> According to al-Sha'bī, one of the sources of Balādhurī and Ṭabarī, the population of Kūfa at the time of its foundation numbered twenty thousand; and of these twelve thousand were from Yemen and the rest from Nizār.<sup>6</sup> However, Ṭabarī says it numbered one hundred thousand, probably misinterpreting a statement made by the Caliph 'Omar

---

1. Futūḥ, pp. 255-262.

2. Futūḥ, p. 274; Khalīfa, I, 129.

3. Futūḥ, p. 274.

4. Ṭabarī, IV, 192.

5. Buldān, pp. 310-311.

6. Futūḥ, p. 276.

when he sent al-Mughīra b. Shu'ba as governor in the year 21/641.<sup>1</sup>

From the beginning some attempt was made to organize these tribes; we first hear of them being divided into a'shār "tens", the precise meaning of which remains obscure, and shortly afterwards into asbā' "sevens". Under the latter, the tribes were classified into seven groups, and to the leadership of each was appointed a person with the title of Amīr (or Ra'īs al-Sub') who acted as an intermediary between his group and the governor.<sup>2</sup> Tabarī, reporting from Saif, supplies

- 
1. The words of 'Omar are: وأي عظيم أعظم من مائة ألف سيف  
لا يرضون عن أمير ولا يرضى عنهم أمير.

"What could be worse than a hundred thousand men who will not accept a governor - Amīr - and he will not accept them". Tabarī, IV, 262.

Here the numeral 100,000 is probably intended as a noun of magnitude, and should not be understood as expressing an exact amount. The same interpretation should probably be given, also, to Mu'āwiya's use of 100,000 when he advises his son Yazīd, "Give them (the people of Kūfa) what they ask, for this is better than having 100,000 swords directed against you". Ansāb al-Ashraf, III, f.143.

2. Iqd, IV, 162. It is unlikely, however, that at this period the title Amīr would have been recognized to such subordinates, and Ra'īs seems more a probable designation.

the names and composition of these divisions, though, in fact, he lists only six: (1) Kinda and its allies, along with Jadīla; (2) Quḍā'a, Bajīla, Khath'am, Ḥaḍramawt and Azd; (3) Madhḥij, Ḥimyar and Hamdān, with their allies; (4) Tamīm, Ribāb and Hawāzin; (5) Asad, Ghaṭafān, Muḥārib, Namir, Dubai'a and Taghlib; (6) Iyād, 'Akk, 'Abd al-Qais, the Hajarites and the Ḥamrā' (the local, non-Arab people).<sup>1</sup> The group omitted here was very likely Tayy, reference to which is made by Ya'qūbī in the same connection.<sup>2</sup>

When Ziyād b. Abīhi became governor of Kūfa in 50/670 these "sevens" were reduced to four (arbā'): (1) Tamīm and Hamdān; (2) Rabī'a and Kinda; (3) Madhḥij and Asad; (4) Ahl al-Medīna,<sup>3</sup>. The apparent aim of this reduction in the number of tribal units was to achieve administrative simplicity, but at the same time it lessened the centres from which dissent against the central government might rise. It is notable, too, that, apart from ahl al-Medīna, each group consists of tribal units of differing origins which were presumably antipathetic to one another, whereby it would be

---

1. Ṭabarī, IV, 194.

2. Buldān, pp. 310-311.

3. Ṭabarī, V, 268.

difficult for them to speak with a single voice in matters affecting relations with the governors. By this time the population of Kūfa is said to have risen to sixty thousand fighting men; their families and dependants numbered an additional one hundred and twenty thousand.<sup>1</sup>

### The Distribution of the Tribes in Kūfa

In respect of its tribal composition, Kūfa presents a wholly different picture from Baṣra, and this difference was made even more prominent when the city became for a short while the capital of the Muslims during the Caliphate of ʿAlī. This transference of the central power from Medīna was understood by the Kūfans as placing themselves in the privileged position which the *Medīneṣṣhad* held since the rise of Islām, and their partisanship for ʿAlī must have arisen from the new

---

1. *Iqd*, V, 8. These numbers should, of course, be treated with reserve; as, in fact, should the term "city" itself. That an urban establishment capable of accommodation for such a population could have developed so shortly *within* a quarter of a century is impossible to accept, given the circumstances of the period and the nature of the people involved.



status which he hereby conferred upon them. Here, their own self-interest inspired them to support him in his struggle with Mu'āwiyā - which was, in effect, a contest between 'Irāq and Syria<sup>1</sup> - and the name given to their political party, the shī'at 'Alī, was later to become the designation of a religious sect. At this period, Shī'ism was the allegiance in which the peoples of divergent tribal backgrounds could submerge their differences and act in unity; In Baṣra on the other hand there was no such centre about which to rally, and the tribes were in constant hostility with one another.<sup>2</sup> There is little evidence to support the opinion that an innate religious predisposition influenced Kūfan Arabs to espouse Shī'ism,<sup>3</sup> and even less to allow the assumption that 'Alī held a sacerdotal position among them at this time.

---

1. Iqd, VI, 248.

2. Tabarī, IV, 375.

3. W.M. Watt, for example, argues, "Since in period of stress men tend to revert to a primitive level at which they have experienced security, those men from South Arabia looked round for a superhuman leader. South Arabia had a tradition of many centuries of prosperity under divine kings". Islamic Political Thought, p.44. The Southern Arabs had no overwhelming superiority in numbers in Kūfa, al-Sha'bī giving the proportion between South and North as twelve thousand to eight thousand. Futūḥ, p. 276.

The historical tradition attempts to establish a special relationship between 'Alī and the Yemen, the story running that the Prophet sent him there in the year 9/630 in order to invite the people to Islām.<sup>1</sup> In his presence all the tribes of Hamdān are reported to have accepted conversion in one day;<sup>2</sup> and when later he became Caliph the Yemenites were among the first to offer him homage.<sup>3</sup> However, we need not dwell too long on the historicity or otherwise of this account in order to explain the support that 'Alī received from this quarter during the events that led up to the assassination of 'Uthmān; Medīna had been trying to maintain the new movement as a Hijāzī enterprise, excluding other Arabs from the central direction and discriminating against them in the division of the fruits of the conquests. 'Alī's rivalry with 'Uthmān for the Caliphate made him the leader of an opposition from whom they might expect different treatment if he came to power through their support.

Other incidents are recorded to explain the adherence to 'Alī of individual groups and tribes. Ibn A'tham finds it significant to report how 'Alī once

---

1. Ṭabarī, III, 132.

2. Ṭabarī, III, 159.

3. Kūfī, I, f.37.

gave protection to a messenger from Kūfa whom 'Uthman was abusing, and thereby gained the gratitude of the people of the city.<sup>1</sup> Others were devoted to 'Alī because of his piety,<sup>2</sup> and his reputation as a valiant warrior was of especial appeal to the tribal Arabs. The tribe of Hamdān, which was very numerous in Kūfa, was deeply attached to him;<sup>3</sup> Asad, Tayy and Bakr supported him against the rebels Ṭalḥa and Zubair;<sup>4</sup> and Rabī'a were reckoned to be among his most loyal and valiant adherents.<sup>5</sup>

To the latter Alī had said: "O Rabī'a, you are the most devoted allies who responded to my appeal, and of all the Arabs the most trustworthy".<sup>6</sup> It should be

---

1. Kūfī, I, f. 37.

2. Iklīl, X, 66.

3. Kūfī, I, fll and Naṣr, Ṣiffīn, p. 290, both speak of the prominence of Hamdān in the city, and the latter, also, mentions their loyalty to 'Alī. Al-Mas'ūdī, Murūj, III, 93, on the other hand, mentions how deep was the affection in which 'Alī held the men of this tribe.

4. Ṭabarī, V, pp. 186-187.

5. Murūj, III, 57.

6. Ṣiffīn, p. 287.

noted that Rabī'a was located exclusively in 'Irāq with no territory whatsoever in Syria; however, most of the other tribes which are mentioned as supporting him are divided between the two provinces and are, moreover almost equally made up of Northern and Southern Arab. These are: Madhḥij, Kinda, Bajīla, Qais, 'Abd al-Qais, Tamīm, Dabba, Ribāb, Quraish, Kināna, Khath'am, Khuzā'a, Qudā'a and Ash'ar.<sup>1</sup> Unfortunately our source does not explain which of these tribal groups had come into the territory with the Islamic expansion and which had been settled longer there,<sup>information</sup> which would shed light on the regional aspects of the war between 'Alī and Mu'āwiya.

The later religious devotion to 'Alī among the Shī'ites is, of course, referred back to this period in their literature, in which emphasis is laid on his saintly qualities and the response these evoked from his associates. Even Ṭabarī contributes to the legendary history: at the Battle of the Camel a man of Dhuhl encourages his brother with the words "Our cause is just.....for we are associated with the family of the Prophet."<sup>2</sup>

---

1. Ṣiffīn, index.

2. Ṭabarī, IV, 522.



After the assassination of 'Alī, the Caliphate, with the political and economic power which it embodied, passed to Damascus, leaving Kūfa no more than a provincial city. The revenues which the Umayyads drew from 'Irāq were regarded by the tribes settled there as the exactions of a victor from the conquered, and the spirit of revolt which was to be so characteristic of Kūfa throughout its early history was probably born of a desire to revenge and redress this humiliation. Despite the rôle they had played in the murder of 'Alī, the Khawārij were most representative of this spirit. It is significant that they presented their own cause as the cause of Islām.<sup>1</sup>

Mu'āwiya attempted to deal with this hostility by bribes and intimidation,<sup>2</sup> but chiefly by creating discord among the tribes in the region and preventing them from maintaining a united opposition. Thus, he was able to move groups from here to other territories and replace them by men from Syria on whose loyalty he felt he could rely. The policy of Nawāqil,<sup>3</sup> and the

- 
1. Wellhausen, p. 60; "The cause of the province became also the cause of Islām. God and the right took the field against force; the opposition united with the faith".
  2. Ṣiffīn, p. 139.
  3. Ṭabarī, III, 240.

dispersion of Khārijite sentiments throughout the Islamic world can be seen as commencing even from this time, several years before the purges of Ziyād and al-Ḥajjāj.

The first governor appointed to Kūfa by Mu'āwīya, al-Mughīra b. Shu'ba of Thaqīf (41/661 - 50/670), displayed a notable degree of independence towards his master and did not interfere in the fluctuations of the political life of the city. The impression is given that he regarded this appointment as an attempt to remove his presence from the centre of activity in the Ḥijāz, and to exploit his prestige among the people who had formerly supported 'Alī.<sup>1</sup> However, his successor, Ziyād b. Abīhi initiated a new policy of coercion in order to rid the region of those dissidents who might support the latent tendencies to revolt there. Until the year 50/670 he had been governor of Baṣra, but after the death of al-Mughīra, Kūfa too, was included under his authority.

The first effort to solve the unrest of lower

---

1. He was already an old man at the time of his appointment, more concerned with leading a quiet and self-indulgent life than with war and politics, and this may have been another reason behind his selection as governor. Ṭabarī, V, 234; Aghānī, XVI, 86, 155.

‘Irāq was made by him in 51/671, when he moved fifty thousand of the Arab population, chosen equally from Baṣra and Kūfa, to Khurāsān. The matter is very inadequately treated in Ṭabarī (VI, 160, 128) and Balādhurī (Futūḥ, 400),<sup>1</sup> but the consequences of such a massive emigration could not but have had important consequences for both Khurāsān and ‘Irāq.

However, if Ziyād had thought to pacify his territories by such measures he was soon to be undeceived. In that same year, the pious and respected Ḥujr b. ‘Adī<sup>2</sup> led a protest against the Umayyads, centering his attack on the official policy of cursing ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib.<sup>3</sup> He had expected to receive the support of the Yemenite tribes - in particular from Kinda - and, indeed, Ziyād, too, thought that they might rally around him. There was a danger that if he attempted to suppress Ḥujr, who was from Kinda, with

- 
1. It is probably for this reason that it has attracted such scant attention among European scholars. Wellhausen, for example, merely comments that it was a political move and makes no effort to interpret its significance. The Arab Kingdom, p. 125; see H. Lammens, Études sur le siècle des Omayyades, p. 132.
  2. Ṭabaqāt, VI, 151, 153.
  3. Nahj, III, 15.

any of the northern tribes, a civil war might break out. Therefore he entrusted Madhḥij and Hamdān with this task and did not involve any of the 'Adnānites. In the event, Kinda did not lend its support to Ḥujr, apparently intimidated by Ziyād.<sup>1</sup>

Ziyād was successful in exploiting the hostility which existed between Kinda and Asad in this affair.<sup>2</sup> However, he was unable to influence Ṭayy to withdraw this support from 'Abdallāh b. Khalīfa al-Ṭā'ī who was a follower of Ḥujr. From this may be inferred that Ṭayy was strong relative to the other tribes in Kūfa, and was prepared to defy the governor openly. The weaker tribes were forced into making secret alliances with one another, and contributed to the conspiratorial atmosphere in which revolutionary groups such as the Khawārij and the Shī'a were able to develop.<sup>3</sup> But these alliances and compacts proved to be very unstable, as can be seen from the way in which the promised support for Ḥusain b. 'Alī failed to materialise when he was deceived into going to Kūfa to head a new

---

1. Ṭabarī, VI, 146; Aghānī, XVI, pp. 4-5.

2. Ṭabarī, VI, 151. Rabi'a, which was the ally of Kinda, also became disaffected with Ziyād because of the way he had manipulated events to his own advantage.  
Ṭabarī, VI, 151.

3. Ḥadā'iq, III, 108.



government.<sup>1</sup> The poet al-Farazdaq was well aware of the inconstancy of the Kūfans, and he warned Husain that even if their sentiments favoured him they would still use their swords against him,<sup>2</sup> presumably in return for Umayyad money.

The revolt of al-Mukhtār in the year 66/685 produced a more positive response from the Kūfans, and showed the way in which the tribes had been polarized in the period since Ziyād. Those who are mentioned as his adherents are Hamdān, Madhḥij, Asad, Rabī'a, Nahd, Kinda, Khath'am, Bāhila, Banū Sulaim and Banū 'Ugail,<sup>3</sup> but it must not be supposed that all of these joined the revolt out of the same motives. Rabī'a, the inveterate enemy of Muḍar, to which most of the Umayyad governors belonged, was a predictable adherent; yet even some of

- 
1. Dīnawarī, pp. 243-244; Ṭabarī, VI, 962. In the letters which had been sent to him at Medīna asking him to come here and form a new caliphate, he was promised the support of forty thousand men.
  2. Aghānī, XIX, pp. 47-48.
  3. Most of these are shown as supporting al-Mukhtār in the account of the revolt given by Dīnawarī, pp. 299-300; the Ansāb, speaks of the participation of Asad (V, 234) and Khath'am (V, 260).

its sections remained neutral.<sup>1</sup> Echoes of the struggle between ‘Uthmān and ‘Alī were to be heard, particularly among Bajīla, which had never abandoned its ‘Alīd inclinations.<sup>2</sup>

The local opposition to al-Mukhtār included Azd ‘Umān, ‘Abs, Dhubyān and, especially, the powerful Tamīm, all of whom felt antipathy towards any man from Thaḳīf.<sup>3</sup> But, when it became apparent that al-Mukhtār was using the power he had gained for his own personal ends rather than to advance the cause of the Banū Hāshim, certain of his former supporters passed into opposition. Notable among these were Yemenī tribes such as Kinda, Azd and Nakha‘. Certain other tribes objected to the favour which he showed to non-Arab mawālī, treating them as equals and according them the same privileges.<sup>4</sup>

---

1. Dīnawarī, p. 292.

2. Ansāb, V, pp. 232-233, where the verses of a poet from Bajīla are quoted in which the words anā ‘alā dīnī ‘Alī are used. The tribe appears to have been alienated by the financial exactions ‘Uthmān had made on the people of Kūfa. Ṭabarī, VI, 66.

3. Ansāb, V, 236, 245. The important position held by Tamīm in Kūfa is variously attested; cf. Ansāb, V, 289; Faḳīh, p. 83; Ṣiffīn, p. 248.

4. Ṭabarī, VI, 94. Mubarrad, Kāmil, I, 44, reports that the mawālī regarded al-Mukhtar as their deliverer.

In fact, the revolt of al-Mukhtār split the Yemenī tribes into two factions; the one supporting him because he had avenged the death of Ḥusain b. ‘Alī, and the other disaffected by the equality he was conferring on the mawālī. Of course, all the tribes loyal to the Umayyads were ranged against him, and it was they who provided the nucleus around which the others could rally.<sup>1</sup> A delegation from the tribes hostile to al-Mukhtār went to Baṣra to solicit the help of the governor Muṣ‘ab b. al-Zubair, and in the year 67/686 he led his Baṣrān troops against the rebel and captured Kūfa. Al-Mukhtār lost his life in the fighting.<sup>2</sup>

---

1. Dīnawarī, p. 292.

2. Ṭabarī, VI, 103.

## CHAPTER III

ARAB TRIBES IN BAṢRA

Although the situation in Baṣra might have been expected to have much the same features as that of Kūfa, in fact what we find is significantly different. There was no general anti-Umayyad feeling to give political direction to the activities of the people, and this may be due to the fact that very few of the prominent figures of the original Islamic establishment settled here. For example, while seventy who had fought alongside the Prophet at the Battle of Badr had lived in Kūfa,<sup>1</sup> only one, 'Utba b. Ghazwān, was associated with Baṣra. What political sentiment existed was variable and usually connected with self-interest and <sup>the</sup> defensive policies of the three important tribes which dominated the region: Tamīm, Bakr and Azd.

Tamīm

Baṣra was founded by 'Utba b. Ghazwān in the territories of Tamīm and Bakr, and of these two, the

---

1. Faqīh, p. 66.



former was by far the largest and most influential, and consequently able to impose its will on the new city.<sup>1</sup> Among the mawālī who were attracted to seek protection of Tamīm were the Persian Asāwira, and others given such names as Zutt and Sayābiḡa.<sup>2</sup> There can be no doubt as to the predominant position of the Tamīm in Baṣra during the Umayyad Period, and this, of course, was bound to give rise to fanciful legends about its heroic past.<sup>3</sup> Throughout the period in which Baṣra was establishing itself as one of the important centres of the new Islamic state, Tamīm was under the leadership of Aḡnaf b. Qais (d. 70/689).<sup>4</sup>

---

1. Ibn al-Faḡīh, pp. 166, 189, speaks of Tamīm as being among the first occupants of the city; and earlier, p. 33, he had related a story describing the strength of the tribe in his region. Other sources, such as Ibn al-Kalbī, I, f.95 and Sharḡ Nahj al-Balāgha, III, 425, agree on its wealth and nobility. The Aghānī, VIII, 58, contains a poem by Jarīr which mentions the four famous families of Tamīm as being: Ribāb, Sa'd, 'Amr, and Ḥanṣala.

2. Futūḡ, p. 367; Murūj, III, 34.

3. For example, the 'Iqd, III, 332, speaks of its prominence in the Jāhiliyya: the men of Tamīm were the Jamājim al-'Arab, "the head and source of the nation". Bayān, I, 53, describes the language spoken by them as being the purest Arabic, even winning the admiration of the Prophet.

4. C.H. Pellat, E.I.<sup>2</sup>, I, pp. 303-4, s.v. Aḡnaf b. Qais.

His policy of co-operation with the Umayyad governors who were sent here assured his people of the favour of the Caliphs which was denied to rebellious Kūfa, and was in line with the neutral position he had already adopted in the struggle between 'Alī and Zubair. This reluctance to commit himself to affairs outside his own territories and become involved in the fluctuating politics of the Umayyads gave a stability to the life of the city that contrasted markedly with its neighbour. But Tamīm was too large to be wholly monolithic in its sentiments, and we find important sections of it giving support to 'Alī, to Ṭalḥa and Zubair,<sup>1</sup> and also to Mu'āwiya.<sup>2</sup> Moreover, most of the leaders of the Khawārij were from this tribe.<sup>3</sup>

#### Azd

Tamīm had as its most serious and bitter rival in Basra, the powerful tribe of Azd, which had first come

- 
1. Ṭabarī, V, pp. 200-206; Nahj, III, 425. The two sources show sections of Tamīm as fighting both in support<sup>of</sup> and against 'Alī in his conflict with Ṭalḥa and Zubair.
  2. Ṭabarī, VI, 136.
  3. The impression given by Ansāb, IV, ii, p.101, and Murūj, III, 200 is that the leadership and the following of the Kharijites were predominantly from Tamīm.

here from 'Umān under the leadership of 'Uthmān b. Sa'id b. Abī al-'Āṣ al-Thaqafī during the reign of 'Omar b. al-Khaṭṭab.<sup>1</sup> This led to a continuous migration northwards, which ultimately produced a great concentration of its people in Southern 'Irāq.<sup>2</sup> Abū 'Ubaida said of Azd: "They are the best fighters of Yemen".<sup>3</sup>

Hostility between Azd and Tamīm was deep-rooted, and influenced the political life of the city. An amusing story told by Ibn Qutaiba illustrates the depth of feeling which may have existed between the two tribes: A man of Azd was observed in Mecca praying for his father. When asked, why do you not pray for your mother, too?" he replied, "Because she was from Tamīm".<sup>4</sup>

---

1. Bad', V, 183.

2. A'lāq, p. 207; Aghānī, XIV, 300.

3. Iqd, III, 334. The Al Muhallab was the leading family of Azd in Baṣra (Ṣifat, p.401; Faḳīh, p. 190) and according to both Mubarrad (Nasab 'Adnān wa Qaḥṭān, p.21) and Hamdānī (Ṣifat, p. 401) was of the clan of 'Atīk. The Aghānī, XIV, 300, says that the family was of Persian origin; Abū Ṣufra, the father of Muhallab, had emigrated to 'Umān and joined Azd, and came north with them under 'Uthmān b. Abī al-'Āṣ to Baṣra. Cf. also A'lāq, p. 207.

4. 'Uyūn al-Akḥbār, III, 113.

### Bakr

The third largest of the tribes settled in Baṣra was Bakr. As compared with the other two it was said to be more obedient and tractable to those under whose authority it lived.<sup>1</sup> Unlike the others, they can be described as native *to* Southern 'Irāq, having dwelt in this region before the rise of Islām. Their presence in Baṣra dates from the time when their leader, Suwaid b. Qutba, allied himself to 'Utba b. Ghazwān, and they can thus be regarded as among the founders of the city.<sup>2</sup>

Four other tribes were prominently represented in Baṣra, about only one of which do we have any information as to origins: 'Abd al-Qais, which had migrated here from Bahrain along with Azd, as part of the army of 'Uthmān b. Abī al-'Āṣ.<sup>3</sup> The famous family of al-Jārūd was of this tribe.<sup>4</sup> Of Qais, Rabī'a and al-'Āliya we know little before they began to play a role in the affairs of the city.<sup>5</sup>

---

1. Murūj, III, 34.

2. Futūḥ, p. 337.

3. Bad', V, 183.

4. Faqīh, pp. 170, 190.

5. Ibn Sa'd, unfortunately, does not indicate the tribal associations of the men whom he lists in this region, giving <sup>only</sup> personal names. Ṭabaqāt, index. Al-'Āliya was not really a tribe, but rather a designation of the people who had settled in the vicinity of 'Āliyat al-Hijāz. Mubarrad, I, 116.



The relationship of these tribes during the early years of the city would seem to have been peaceful, for indeed the place was little more than a base for operations connected with the conquests and had not yet developed a constant population with an individual life of its own. This harmony was to be broken here, as in other parts of the Islamic territories, by the murder of the Caliph 'Uthmān in 35/655; men of Baṣra under the leadership of Ḥukaim b. Jabala of Rabī'a had gone to Medīna and participated in the insurrection which culminated in this assassination.<sup>1</sup> There now developed a polarization of the tribal elements in the city: Azd and Dabba supported the Medinese Party led by Ṭalḥa, Zubair and 'Ā'isha which sought revenge for the murder, while Rabī'a, 'Abd al-Qais and Bakr associated themselves with the supporters of 'Alī.

In these events Tamīm remained uncommitted and neutral,<sup>2</sup> apart from a few groups who had sided with

- 
1. Murūj, II, 206; all sources, e.g. Ishtiqāq, p. 332, identify his tribe as Rabī'a.
  2. Ṭabarī, V, 180, explains this neutrality as being due to the harsh treatment a man of the Sa'd branch of Tamīm had received at the hands of Ṭalḥa and Zubair.

Ṭalḥa and Zubair at the Battle of the Camel.<sup>1</sup> Indeed, similar exceptions could be found in most tribes: Bakr which, on the whole, supported 'Alī also had some of its men present at this battle in the ranks of Ṭalḥa and Zubair.<sup>2</sup>

The Azd of Baṣra supported the Medinese Party against 'Alī presumably because the Azd of Syria had taken the side of Mu'awiya. At the Battle of the Camel, 'Ā'isha exhorts the men of Azd: "Oh Āl Ghassān, remember today that bravery of yours of which we have heard so much!", and this association of the tribe with the pre-Islamic Arabs of Syria must have a special significance for these warriors who had come north from 'Umān into these strange lands.<sup>3</sup>

It was clearly Mu'awiya's intention to foment disunity among the tribes which could be exploited in his own interest. In 37/657 he sent 'Abdallāh b. al-Ḥaḍramī to Baṣra to win support against 'Alī, with instructions to cultivate Muḍar and Azd, but to avoid Rabī'a, who were wholly committed to the cause of 'Alī.<sup>4</sup>

---

1. Ṭabarī, V, 116; Kāmil, III, pp. 103-106.

2. Kāmil, III, 106.

3. Ibid., III, pp. 105-106.

4. Ibid., III, 157.

In these loyalties Muḍar and Rabī'a were merely projecting into Islām the traditional hostility which had always characterized their relations. The saying had become current that Rabī'a was angry at God for having selected the Prophet from Muḍar.<sup>1</sup> Also, recorded as an example of the 'aṣabiyya of Rabī'a were the words of one apostate who said: "I testify that Muḥammad is the true Prophet and Musailima is false; but a false prophet from Rabī'a is preferable to a true one from Muḍar."<sup>2</sup>

The susceptibility of the Bedouin to bribery was also exploited by Mu'āwiya; whereas 'Alī would only pay them what was their due as Muslims out of the bayt al-Māl, the Umayyad policy was to lavish money on whomsoever could be of use. In this way the tribes of Baṣra, and in particular Tamīm, were won over.<sup>3</sup> Ziyād b. Abīhi wrote to 'Alī from Baṣra: "Ibn al-Ḥaḍramī has come here from Syria and dwells among Tamīm. Announcing the murder of 'Uthmān, he has called the people to arms; and Tamīm and most of the other Baṣrians have responded".<sup>4</sup>

---

1. Bayān, II, 237.

2. Ṭabarī, III, 286.

3. Ibid., VI, 18.

4. Ibid., VI, 64.

A certain Ḥammād b. Sulaimān said of Baṣra; "It is a Piece of Syria amongst us".<sup>1</sup>

After the Battle of the Camel, the tribes of Baṣra became very inconstant in their allegiance, and in general what support they were prepared to give to either of the two contestants for the Caliphate was very much subordinate to the pursuit of their own self-interest. The first Umayyad governor, 'Abd Allāh b. 'Āmir (41/661 - 44/664), was unable to control the tribes, nor was his successor al-Ḥārith b. 'Abd Allāh al-Azdī any more successful. The latter held office only a few months, in fact. The first serious effort to make Baṣra responsive to the will of the central government came with the appointment of Ziyād b. Abīhi as a governor in 45/665.<sup>2</sup> He had long experience of the city, going back to the period when he kept the army accounts for the governor, Abū Mūsā al-Ash'arī (17/638 - 29/649).<sup>3</sup> He showed his resourcefulness when, during the reign of 'Alī, he contrived to win the support of Azd in suppressing the revolt of Tamīm which had been

---

1. Tabaqāt, VI, 232.

2. Ṭabarī, VI, 123; Khalīfa, I, 241.

3. Jahshiyārī, pp. 17-18.



instigated by Ibn al-Ḥaḍramī.<sup>1</sup>

The famous addresses of Ziyād to the people of Baṣra emphasize the way in which tribal rivalries were damaging the life of the city: "You are putting tribal loyalties before religion.... You are excusing and sheltering criminals from amongst you, and tearing down the protecting laws sanctified by Islām...."<sup>2</sup> It is to Ziyād's credit that he, a man of unknown origins, could so influence a city which was composed of groups organized along traditional tribal lines. It may well be that the very obscurity of his birth made it possible for him to appear in a position of neutrality amidst the tribal rivalries, and we are told that his administration won the general approval of the people.<sup>3</sup> Ziyād b. Samura al-Fazārī of Qais acted as his deputy when he had to leave the city,<sup>4</sup> and he showed his trust

- 
1. Ṭabarī, V, 110. Azd had hitherto been supporting Mu'awiya against 'Alī, and it was an act of clever diplomacy to win them over at this time. However, there was a long-standing rivalry between Azd and Tamīm, and the growing power of the latter must have excited envy and apprehension.
  2. Bayān, II, pp. 62-63; 'Iqd, IV, pp. 110-111; Wellhausen, p. 122.
  3. Ibid., II, 65.
  4. Ṭabarī, VI, 166.

in Azd by moving the bayt al-māl into their quarter.<sup>1</sup> When a man of Azd, Nāfi' b. Khālīd, who had been Ziyād's 'āmil in Bushanj, stole a sum of money, he escaped punishment for his crime through the intercession of his fellow-tribesmen.<sup>2</sup> Tamīm, too, found it expedient to fall in with the wishes of the governor.

Ziyād organized the tribes of Baṣra into five groups - akhmās: Ahl al-'Āliya, Tamīm, Bakr, Azd and Kinda, and 'Abd al-Qais, with chiefs of each tribe responsible for the behaviour of its members.<sup>3</sup> In order to be in a position to influence these tribes and assure their loyalty, he formed a private guard of five hundred men - the ḥaras - under his sole command.<sup>4</sup> The affairs of the treasury were left in the hands of the mawālī, for to place the disposal of money in the hands of any of the Arabs would have immediately excited suspicion and envy among the others.<sup>5</sup>

That he met with opposition, too, cannot be doubted; and the mass movement of Arabs from Baṣra to Khurāsān and

---

1. Bayān, II, 271.

2. Ṭabarī, VI, 127.

3. Khawārizmī, p. 73.

4. Ṭabarī, VI, 127.

5. Ya'qūbī, II, 170.

other places may have been his way of dealing with large-scale dissent.<sup>1</sup> Ziyād enjoyed the confidence and support of his Umayyad masters in the course he followed, and his area of authority was enlarged to include Sistan, Fārs, Sind and India.<sup>2</sup> His ambitions, too, were large. He wrote to Mu'āwiya: "I hold 'Irāq in my right hand, but still my left is empty", whereupon he was granted the governorship of the Hijāz.<sup>3</sup> However, he died before he could take up this responsibility.

His successor in Baṣra, 'Abdallāh b. 'Amr b. Ghailān, was merely a temporary appointment until a man of greater abilities could be found to take control of the Province, and this in fact was to be Ziyād's son, 'Ubaidallāh. Mu'āwiya does not appear to have had the confidence in the latter that he had in Ziyād, and the appointment seems to have been made only in response

- 
1. In 51/671, twenty-five thousand men were sent from here and another twenty-five from Kūfa, to serve under the new governor of Khurāsān, al-Rabī'a b. Ziyād al-Ḥārithī. Ṭabarī, VI, 128, 160-161. This balance between men from the rival cities may have been intended to assure that they would never unite against him. Mention is made, also, of sections of Qais being transferred to Jazīra. Ishtiqāq, p. 272.
  2. Ṭabarī, VI, 134.
  3. Ibid., V, 289.

to the importuning of 'Ubaidallāh.<sup>1</sup>

But it was to become clear that the son had not his father's skill in manipulating the tribes. Being related through marriage with Qais,<sup>2</sup> he was able to maintain their loyalty, but it took the intervention of Mu'āwiyā to improve relations between him and Ahnaf b. Qais, the chief of Tamīm.<sup>3</sup> However, his main reliance rested on a body of about two thousand non-Arab slave troops which he had brought back with him from Bukhārā,<sup>4</sup> and for a while he was able to control his province with this support. But in 64/683, when the news arrived of the death of Yazīd I, it was the signal for a general uprising against the Umayyads by the tribes of Baṣra.

'Ubaidallāh was at a loss to know how he could win the confidence of the tribesmen; he professed to share their hatred of Yazīd, and even tried to have them

- 
1. Iqd, IV, 87. Ṭabarī, V, 296, describes how 'Ubaidallāh pleaded with Mu'āwiyā to receive this appointment, addressing him as "my uncle" on the basis of the fictitious relationship between him and Ziyād.
  2. Ansāb, IV, ii, pp. 82-83.
  3. Ṭabarī, V, pp. 316-317. Subsequent events also indicate that he retained the support of Azd which his father had enjoyed.
  4. Ṭabarī, V, 298; Narshakhī, p. 37.



declare the bay'a to him, but as governor of the territory, not as Caliph.<sup>1</sup> This only excited the ridicule of the people; after touching hands with him in the Dār al-Imāra as an act of homage, they came out and rubbed their hands on the walls, saying: "Does Ibn Murjāna think we would entrust him with our affairs at a time of disunity?"<sup>2</sup> Even Azd, who had been so loyal to his father, refused at first to help him; its leader, Mas'ūd b. 'Amr, was reluctant to take a stand against all the other tribes, and he felt, too, that the rewards which had been received for the loyalty shown to Ziyād were not great enough.<sup>3</sup> Some understanding was arrived at, however, and Azd gave protection to 'Ubaidallāh when he left Baṣra for Syria, happy to have escaped with his life.<sup>4</sup>

The narrative of events in the city are so confused that it is not possible to present a clear picture of the tribal alliances and factions at this time. The

---

1. Ansāb, IV, ii, pp. 115-116; Ṭabarī, V, 507.

2. Ṭabarī, V, 507.

3. Ibid., V, 510.

4. Dīnawarī, p.277, describes his passage through the territories of the Banū Sulaim and the Banū Nājiya, while al-Kūfī, I, f.421, mentions that he left his mother and wife behind in Baṣra.

position of Tamīm is ambiguous: they were prepared to allow 'Uбайдallāh to remain in Baṣra until order was restored, but no sooner had he escaped than they paid homage to 'Abdallāh b. al-Ḥārith al-Ḥāshimī, without having consulted Azd and Bakr. Ibn al-Ḥārith was to be the instrument of Tamīm in gaining control of the city; being from Mudar, he could be expected to have the loyalty of all the tribes of this stock, including Azd and Bakr. These two had a long-standing alliance, and the influx of Azdī tribes towards the end of Mu'āwiyā's reign was to greatly strengthen their political power in the region.<sup>1</sup> Although it had been proposed that Tamīm should try to win these newcomers over to their side, it was feared that if they made the first move towards such an alliance it would place them in a subordinate position; and,

- 
1. The self-contradiction of sources such as the Ansāb al-Ashraf and the Naqā'id in dealing with these events is characteristic of the confused views of the later historians. The alliance between Azd and Bakr in the Jahiliyya, however, is well attested, cf. Naqā'id, II, 730; Iqd, III, 392; and this was further strengthened by the friendship between the Banū Dhuhl b. Tha'laba b. Bakr and Thu'al b. 'Amr b. al-Ghawth b. Tayy; cf. Ṭabarī, VII, 27, where the migration of Azd into Baṣra at this time are noted also. Where they came from is not made clear.

consequently the way was left open for the union of Azd with Bakr.<sup>1</sup>

This account, of course, ignores the long-standing hostility shared by Azd and Bakr against Tamīm, which would have made alliance with the latter unfeasible in any circumstances.<sup>2</sup> It was this common traditional enemy that brought the two together, and the alliance was renewed by Mālik b. Misma', the chief of Bakr, at this time.<sup>3</sup> Abū 'Ubaida mentions that this move was made on the recommendation of 'Ubaidallāh b. Ziyād, who wanted to strengthen the support against Tamīm which he was receiving from Azd.<sup>4</sup> He is said to have paid more than two hundred thousand dirhams to them to achieve this alliance, the overall leadership of which was given to Mas'ūd b. 'Amr of Azd.<sup>5</sup> 'Ubaidallāh is presented as wishing Mas'ūd to assume responsibility for Baṣra until

1. Such as the simplified explanation of Abū 'Ubaida, Ṭabarī, VII, 27.
2. Ṭabarī, II, 132. In the 'Iqd, IV, 302, the verse of the poet al-Ṭirimmāḥ is quoted to show the hostility of Azd and Tamīm:

لو حان ورد تميم ثم قيل لهم حوض الرسول عليه السلام ترد

3. Ṭabarī, VII, 27.
4. Naqā'id, II, 729.
5. Ṭabarī, VII, 25; Naqā'id, II, 729.

affairs had become more settled, and he recommended that homage be paid to him rather than to himself.<sup>1</sup> Naturally, Tamīm would not accept such a situation, and they had support in their opposition from their fellow Muḍarites of Qais.

Mas'ūd went to the mosque and stationed himself at the pulpit to receive the homage of the people, but before an hour had passed he was murdered. The sources are in disagreement as to the authors of this deed. Dīnawarī attributes it to the Khārijites, and is supported by Balādhurī who adds that they did it on the instigation of Aḥnaf b. Qais.<sup>2</sup> In Ṭabarī two contradictory versions of the event are given: the first, from Ishāq b. Yazīd, places the responsibility on Tamīm;<sup>3</sup> while the second, from Ishāq b. Suwad al-'Adawī, relates that Tamīm attempted to make an attack on Mas'ūd but they were

1. Khalīfa, I, 325. The improbability of such a voluntary surrender of authority is, of course, apparent; but the account is interesting as an illustration of how later historians tried to give order to the confusion of events.
2. Dīnawarī, p.281; Ansāb, IV, ii, 98. It is probably because the Khārijites were a name associated with political assassination that they are made responsible.
3. Ṭabarī, V, 520.



prevented by Aḥnaf b. Qais.<sup>1</sup> Ibn A'tham merely says that the people of Baṣra killed him because he was supporting 'Ubaidallāh.<sup>2</sup> Whatever may have been the motives for the murder of Mas'ūd, it must have had as its ultimate cause the rivalry between the tribes over the domination of Baṣra and its region. Indeed, Balādhurī's account of the complicity of Aḥnaf (of Tamīm) in the murder reflects suspicions current among Azd;<sup>3</sup> while Dīnawarī, having already involved the Khārijites, reports, also, this feeling: None other than Tamīm has killed him, so let us slay their lord, Aḥnaf b. Qais.<sup>4</sup>

The leadership of Azd now passed to Ziyād b. 'Amr al-'Atakī, and he formed a pact with Mālīk b. Misma' of Bakr against Tamīm and Qais, forcing them to sue for peace. The speech in which Aḥnaf capitulated is not only of extreme eloquence, but it shows how regional interests were beginning to over-ride old tribal loyalties:<sup>5</sup>

"Oh men of Azd and Rabī'a, you are our brothers in faith, our partners in friendship and descent, and our neighbours in abode. We are united against

---

1. Ṭabarī, V, 518.

2. Kūfī, I, f.422.

3. Ansāb, IV, ii, 98.

4. Dīnawarī, p. 281.

5. 'Iqd, IV, 134.

the enemy. By God, the Azd of Baṣra<sup>are</sup> dearer to us than the Tamīm of Kūfā, and the Azd of Kūfā dearer than the Tamīm of Syria".

Nevertheless, Azd and Bakr took advantage of their superiority to impose strict conditions on Tamīm: either they should go to the desert (bādiya) and leave Baṣra to the victors; or, they should pay a ten-fold blood-wit for Mas'ūd's murder and the usual amount for all others killed in fighting against them, foregoing any recompense for their own dead.<sup>1</sup> The Tamīm chose to remain in Baṣra; but, not having sufficient funds to meet the blood-price demanded, Ahnaf had to travel to Yaḥrīn in Baḥrain to collect money from the tribes of Tamīm in that region.

These problems, which according to Abū 'Ubaida lasted eight or nine months,<sup>3</sup> were the result of Tamīm's having neither wealth nor power. The sources make no mention of the fortunes of Qais during this period, and we do not know if its members, also, had to pay blood-money. The truce which had been arrived at did not bring peace to the city; there was no leader strong enough to stand up to the tribal chiefs, and the latter were

---

1. Ansāb, IV, ii, 122; Dīnawarī, p. 281.

2. Mubarrad, I, 124.

3. Ansāb, IV, ii, p. 115.

unable to inspire confidence in the people. As no internal solution to this disquiet seemed possible, the inhabitants of Baṣra began to look elsewhere for deliverance-to the "political" parties who supported the cause of either the Umayyads or the Hāshimites; the one represented in the city by Qais b. al-Haitham al-Sulamī and the other by al-Nu'mān b. Ṣuhbān al-Rāsibī. These two agreed on a mutually acceptable person to govern the city, 'Abdallāh b. al-Ḥārith b. Nawfal (known affectionately as Babba).<sup>1</sup>

Ṭabarī [without mentioning a source] gives a different account of this selection, omitting all reference to Umayyad and Hāshimite factionalism, and relating it in terms of tribal conflict. Thus, Muḍar wanted al-'Abbās b. al-Aswad b. 'Awf al-Zuhrī, while it was Yemen that wanted 'Abdallāh b. al-Ḥārith. When these two could not agree, it was decided to let al-Nu'mān b. Ṣuhbān and Qais b. al-Haitham make the selection, and only then was the post given to 'Abdallāh b. al-Ḥārith.<sup>2</sup>

Another account in Ṭabarī (relating from 'Awāna) has it that after the assassination of Mas'ūd the people of Baṣra selected 'Abd al-Malik b. 'Abdallāh b. 'Āmir as

---

1. Ansāb, IV, ii, pp. 119-120; Ṭabarī, V, 512.

2. Ṭabarī, V, 512.

their leader; after one month he was succeeded by the above 'Abdallāh b. al-Ḥārith, who lasted only two months in office. Next came 'Omar b. 'Ubaidallāh b. Ma'mar as a representative of 'Abdallāh b. al-Zubair, but he held office for only one month, being replaced by al-Ḥārith b. 'Abdallāh b. Abī Rabi'a, who was also a representative of 'Abdallāh b. al-Zubair.<sup>1</sup> A third account (from 'Omar b. Shabba, probably taken by Ṭabarī from al-Balādhurī) tells that 'Abdallāh b. al-Ḥārith was obliged to retire from office because he could not control the hostility between Muḍar, Rabi'a and Azd, which was threatening to break out into open warfare. The people of Baṣra wrote to Ibn al-Zubair asking that he nominate a governor; he responded by sending Anas b. Mālīk to investigate the situation, and forty days later 'Omar b. 'Ubaidallāh b. Ma'mar arrived.<sup>2</sup>

The Zubairite party was at this time engaged in spreading its propaganda, and in Baṣra Salama b. Dhu'aib of Tamīm was acting as its agent; and it would appear that his activities had begun even before 'Ubaidallāh b. Ziyād left the city.<sup>3</sup> The most trifling

---

1. Ṭabarī, V, 527.

2. Ansāb, V, 188; Ṭabarī, V, 528.

3. Ṭabarī, V, 507.



excuse was sufficient for hostility to break out between Muḍar, Rabīʿa and Azd, and even the leader of these tribes proved unable to control the situation.<sup>1</sup> Azd, for example, deposed their chief, Ashyam b. Shaqīq when he ordered them to behave more peacefully, and appointed Mālik b. Mismaʿ in his place. The authority of the governors, as was to be expected under such circumstances, became very feeble, and their ability to maintain a discipline among the tribes was negligible. They had become so accustomed to hostilities that it seemed the normal condition, and none of them was willing to sacrifice any portion of its independence for the sake of the tranquility of the state. The governors themselves were men of weak character, more concerned with Personal Profit and advantage than with the common good. ʿAbdallāh b. al-Ḥārith b. Nawfal, for example, soon became wealthy from the fruits of his dishonesty.<sup>2</sup> Even al-Ḥārith b. ʿAbdallāh, whom Isfahānī speaks of as a noble and pious dignitary of the Quraish, was unable to bring any influence to bear on the tumultuous elements of Baṣra.<sup>3</sup>

---

1. Ansāb, IV, ii, pp. 105-107; Ṭabarī, V, 515.

2. Ṭabarī, V, 529.

3. Cf. Ṭabarī, VI, 10; the statement of al-Isfahānī appears in Aghānī, I, 66. Other references to al-Ḥārith b. ʿAbdallāh are in accord regarding his good character; cf. Bayān, I, 196; Shiʿr, II, 330; Ansāb, IV, ii, 100; Mubarrad, III, 1093.

Al-Mukhtār and the Tribes of Baṣra

It was during the governorship of al-Ḥārith b. ‘Abdallāh (app. 65-66 a.h.), that al-Mukhtār made a bid to gain control of Kūfa and Baṣra. He was at this time in the former city, from where he sent al-Muthanna b. Mukharriba al-‘Abdī of the tribe of ‘Abd al-Qais<sup>1</sup> to stir up trouble and discontent in Baṣra. When al-Mukhtār seized control of Kūfa, al-Muthanna proclaimed the revolt in Baṣra, too, his first act being to occupy the Dār al-Rizq where the food supplies of the city were held. He thus hoped to gain the power of life and death over the people, by menacing them with starvation. However, his move was premature, and the governor al-Ḥārith b. ‘Abdallāh, was able to frustrate his purposes. Assisted by Tamīm, he was prepared to give battle to ‘Abd al-Qais; but he was opposed in this by both Azd and Bakr. The leader of Azd, Ziyād b. ‘Amr al-‘Atakī, warned him that if he persisted in his intention of fighting ‘Abd al-Qais, he would have them against him, also; Bakr associated themselves with this warning. Their opposition, born out of hostility to Tamīm, allowed al-Muthanna and his supporters to return to Kūfa unscathed.<sup>2</sup>

---

1. Al-Muthanna had participated in the famous battle of ‘Ayn al-Warda on the side of the Tawābīn.

2. Tabarī, VI, pp. 67-68.

Although the sources are not clear on the point, it would seem from the above that an alliance of sorts came into existence at this time between 'Abd al-Qais on the one hand and Bakr and Azd on the other. The support he might expect from these two tribes encouraged al-Mukhtār in his ambition to gain power in Baṣra. He sent a letter to their respective leaders, Ziyād b. 'Amr (Azd) and Mālīk b. Mīsmā' (Bakr), which read in part:

"If you heed my words and follow my summons, I shall endow you with all you wish of this world and guarantee the hereafter for you".

On reading this letter, Mālīk said to Ziyād: "Abū Ishāq (i.e. al-Mukhtār) has been very lavish in his promises, granting us both this world and the next". Ziyād replied: "I do not fight for promises. I fight for whoever pays in cash".<sup>1</sup> Al-Mukhtār clearly understood the venality of these tribal chiefs, and how easily their loyalty could be purchased. He also knew how to menace them, and in a letter to Ahnaf b. Qais, the chief of Tamīm, he warned him of the dangers to himself and his followers if they ventured to oppose him.<sup>2</sup>

---

1. Ṭabarī, VI, 68.

2. Imāma, II, 15; Ṭabarī, VI, 93; Kūfī, II, f.444.

Muṣ'ab in Baṣra

As the grip of al-Ḥārith b. 'Abdallāh on the affairs of Baṣra was seen to grow steadily weaker, 'Abdallāh b. al-Zubair began to fear that the city would be lost to him just as Kūfa had been. Consequently, he sent his brother Muṣ'ab to replace him, and charged him with two objectives: to coerce the tribal leaders in Baṣra into submission, and to put an end to al-Mukhtār's rule in Kūfa.<sup>1</sup> In his first address to the people of Baṣra, Muṣ'ab is reported to have said: "O people of Baṣra, I have heard that you are accustomed to giving nicknames to your governors. Well, I have named myself The Butcher (al-Jazzār)."<sup>2</sup>

He was welcomed and supported by Tamīm, Aḥnaf b. Qais becoming one of his closest confidants;<sup>3</sup> and 'Abbād b. al-Ḥuṣain al-Ḥabaṭī occupying a position of great influence during his governorship. The tribe of 'Abd al-Qais was hesitant in its response to his appeal; some supported him, while others chose to be defiant. When these latter realized that they were not strong enough to give battle to him they moved from the city and went

---

1. Ṭabarī, VI, 93.

2. Imāma, II, 15.

3. Dīnawarī, p. 297.

to Kirmān.<sup>1</sup>

Azd appears to have remained hostile to Muṣ'ab, no doubt due to their supposed tribal relations with the Umayyads, though it is also stated the 'Abdallāh b. al-Zubair had been mean in his treatment of them.<sup>2</sup> To overcome their opposition Muṣ'ab summoned their supreme leader al-Muhallab b. Abī Ṣufra from Fārs, and eventually, after much correspondence, he agreed to come. He knew that he was to be used as a tool<sup>not only</sup> with the object of bringing his tribesmen to obedience, but also in the war that was to be waged against al-Mukhtār. He was finally persuaded to come when Muḥammad b. al-Ash'ath the leader of Kinda and the<sup>chief</sup> opponent to al-Mukhtār in Kūfa, arrived with a letter from Muṣ'ab. Al-Muhallab greeted him with these words: "Does a man such as you come as a messenger? Could Muṣ'ab find no one else to carry his letter?" Muḥammad explained that the real problem was not connected with Muṣ'ab, but rather with the need for driving al-Mukhtār from Kūfa: "By God, I am no man's messenger! But our wives, our children and our serving girls (ḥuram) have been taken from us by slaves and (mawālī)".<sup>3</sup> The two leaders - both of whom were of

---

1. Ansāb, (M.S. of the higher Islamic studies Institute, Baghdad) VI, f.204.

2. Ansāb, IV, ii, 28.

3. Ṭabarī, VI, 94; see Dīnawarī, pp. 295-296.



Yemenī origin -- reached an understanding, and when Muhallab arrived in Baṣra his tribesmen in the area immediately submitted to his orders.

Having achieved this agreement, Muṣ'ab advanced on Kūfa accompanied by the Akhmās, i.e., the five most prominent tribal leaders of Baṣra: Mālik b. Misma' who was chief of the Khums of Bakr; Mālik b. al-Mundhir of 'Abd al-Qais; Ahnaf b. Qais of Tamīm; Ziyād b. 'Amr of Azd; and Qais b. al-Haitham of Ahl al-'Āliya. Abū Mikhnaḥ relates that the tribes of Kūfa who were opposed to al-Mukhtār urged Muṣ'ab to bring his rule over the city to an end.<sup>1</sup> In Dīnawarī it is said that more than ten thousand people, led by Muḥammad b. al-Ash'ath, fled from Kūfa to join the forces of Muṣ'ab, and encouraged him to drive out al-Mukhtār.<sup>2</sup>

---

1. Ṭabarī, VI, 95.

2. Dīnawarī, p. 310.

## CHAPTER IV

'IRĀQ AS A UNITED PROVINCEThe Zubairite Period

The sources go into detail on the bitterly-fought battle that took place between al-Mukhtār and Muṣ'ab, and the victory of the latter was seen by the Kūfans as a subjection by Baṣrans. This bred a feeling of hostility that was to persist for a long time, and exacerbate the rivalry between the two cities. Muṣ'ab was now the governor of the whole of 'Irāq,<sup>1</sup> and almost at once distrust grew up between himself and his nominal master 'Abdallāh b. Al-Zubair. The historians of the period, in explanation of this breach in relations, speak of the contrast in the personalities of the two, Muṣ'ab being presented as generous and open-handed while 'Abdallāh b. al-Zubair is said to have been of a miserly nature.<sup>2</sup> According to al-Sha'bī, Muṣ'ab used to pay the 'aṭā twice a year, once in winter and once in summer.<sup>3</sup>

---

1. By 'Irāq is meant, at this time, the southern part of the present national state; Kūfa and Baṣra are sometimes referred to as 'Irāqain.

2. Ansāb, IV, ii, 28; Iqd, IV, 412.

3. Kūfī, II, f.97. The 'aṭā at this time was the payment made to the tribesmen who served in the army and previously it was paid only once a year.

In 67/686, 'Abdallāh b. al-Zubair removed Muṣ'ab from his post and appointed his own son Ḥamza in his place. In doing this 'Abdallāh was careful not to alienate so capable a man, and the reasons he advanced for his action were deliberately ambiguous. This proved to be prudent, for Ḥamza, being young and inexperienced, was unable to impose his authority over the unruly inhabitants of the region, and it was not long before Aḥnaf b. Qais was writing to 'Abdallāh b. al-Zubair urging him to reinstate Muṣ'ab. The following year, therefore, found the latter again back in Baṣra still holding his former position as governor of 'Irāq.<sup>1</sup>

His arrival here caused the Umayyad ruler in Damascus, 'Abd al-Malik b. Marwān, to fear that his own position could be endangered by the type of strong government Muṣ'ab had shown himself capable of forming. He warned the members of his family and his followers: "Having killed al-Mukhtār and occupied 'Irāq and other lands, Muṣ'ab b. al-Zubair will, I believe, invade your country. When a people's home is invaded that is the end of them".<sup>2</sup> No doubt, the chief reason for 'Abd al-Malik's concern was his fear that the revenues which

---

1. Ṭabarī, VI, pp. 117-119.

2. Dīnawarī, p. 301.

had been coming from 'Iraq would be withheld; and this could mean a serious loss to the treasury. From the Sawād alone, it is reported, one hundred and twenty million dirhams were received every year as Kharāj,<sup>1</sup> and besides this there were the considerable amounts paid as Jizya, and in the form of the gifts known as nawrūz and mihrajān.<sup>2</sup>

'Abd al-Malik sought to create difficulties for Muṣ'ab in Baṣra and Kūfa, hoping that in this way he might be able to cause his downfall without recourse to military measures, the outcome of which was always uncertain. He chose a certain Khālīd b. 'Abdallāh b. Asīd to act as his agent in Baṣra, with instructions to foment revolt which, once under way, would be supported by a large Umayyad army.<sup>3</sup> Al-Balādhurī relates that in order to prepare the way for Khālīd, 'Abd al-Malik sent letters to the people of Baṣra (most probably to their leaders), promising them great rewards if they would support his cause; and all responded favourably to this appeal, with the exception of al-Muhallab b. Abī Ṣufra.<sup>4</sup>

---

1. Khurdādhba, pp. 14-15.

2. Ya'qūbī, II, 158.

3. Ṭabarī, VI, 152.

4. Ansāb, IV, ii, 157.

In Ibn A'tham more details are given of this event:

'Abd al-Malik wrote to his own party (li-shī'ati-hi) ordering them to rise against Muṣ'ab and take control of Baṣra; and it is mentioned that at this the people of the city were to be divided into two parties, the Zubairite and the Marwānid.<sup>1</sup> When Khālīd arrived there, he stayed with 'Amr b. Aṣma' al-Bāhilī of Qais, and began to make contact with his supporters, presumably the leaders of the Marwānid faction.<sup>2</sup>

Khālīd was joined by Bakr, under the leadership of Mālik b. Misma', and by Azd, under that of Ziyād b. 'Amr al-'Atakī. The Muhallabī family of Azd, however, refused to participate.<sup>3</sup> According to 'Awāna, it was the Banū Yashkur that first rallied to his summons.<sup>4</sup> Tamīm split on the issue: some, under the leadership of Ṣa'ṣa'a b. Mu'āwiya, the uncle of Aḥnaf b. Qais, gave their support, but the majority, including Aḥnaf himself, refused to do

1. Kūfī, II, f.100.

2. Ṭabarī, VI, 152, has as its source for this event 'Omar b. Shabba, who reports from 'Alī b. Muḥammad, that the name of his host was 'Amr b. Aṣma', and from Abū al-Hasan that it was 'Alī b. Aṣma'.

3. Ansāb, IV, ii, 156.

4. Ibid., IV, ii, 160.



so.<sup>1</sup> Why any section of Tamīm should enter into an alliance which included the traditional enemy Azd is difficult to understand; it may be that there was expectation of great profit for themselves in such a move. ‘Abd al-Qais, too, joined in the revolt.

At this time Muṣ‘ab was in Kūfa; however, his deputy ‘Ubaidallāh b. Ma‘mar, aided by the Zubairites, was able to suppress the insurrection. Details of the elements composing the Zubairite forces are lacking. It may be assumed that Qais was among them, for it is mentioned that Qais b. al-Haitham al-Sulamī was hiring men to fight alongside him in favour of Muṣ‘ab. According to ‘Omar b. Shabba, the fighting went on for twenty four days. When defeated, the rebels were given safe conduct out of Baṣra, and because of this pledge, when Muṣ‘ab returned here from Kūfa he is said to have been unable to exact any revenge from them. However the reason why he did not proceed against them is probably because he feared an imminent invasion from Syria and had to keep his forces intact.<sup>2</sup>

- 
1. Al-Farazdaq refers to this association of a section of Tamīm with their old enemies of Azd in the verses:

عجبت لأقوام تميم أبوهـم وهم في بني سعد عظام المبارك  
 وكانوا أعز الناس قبل مسيرهم إلى الأزد مضجرا لحاها ومالك  
 The alliances formed at the time are given in Ṭabarī, VI, pp. 153-154, and Ansāb, IV, ii, 156.

2. Ṭabarī, VI, 152.

After settling his affairs in Syria, 'Abd al-Malik marched on 'Irāq, and in a battle which took place at Maskin in 71/690<sup>1</sup> Muṣ'ab proved unable to resist the united strength of the Umayyads with the heterogeneous forces he had to rely on. These forces contained elements of Tamīm, Qais, Bakr, 'Abd al-Qais, Kinda, Madhḥij and Azd from both Baṣra and Kūfa, and the rivalry between the two cities was such that even an identity of tribal connection could not produce a feeling of unity. The Kūfans still recalled with rancour the defeat Muṣ'ab and his Baṣran troops had inflicted on them in 67/686; and many of the tribes of Baṣra were coerced into his service. Only a few months previously Azd and Bakr had been in revolt against him.

Defections occurred in the field: 'Omar b. Shabba relates that when Muṣ'ab asked Qaṭan b. 'Abdallāh al-Ḥārithī, the leader of Madhḥij, to face up to the enemy he refused, saying, "Why should I have Madhḥij blood shed?"<sup>2</sup> Dāwūd b. Qaḥdham, the leader of the Bakr tribe in Kūfa, deserted the battlefield, followed by several other tribes.<sup>3</sup> Muṣ'ab was also betrayed by Tamīm.<sup>4</sup>

---

1. According to Mas'ūdī, the battle took place in 72/691. Murūj, III, 307.

2. Ansāb, XI, 7; Ṭabarī, VI, 158; Kūfī, II, f.100.

3. Ansāb, V, 334.

4. Murūj, III, 116; Kūfī, II, f.100.

The bravery of Muṣ'ab in this hopeless battle is highly praised. 'Abd al-Malik, because of their former friendship,<sup>1</sup> urged him to surrender and save his life; but Muṣ'ab, recalling the steadfastness of al-Husain b. 'Alī at Karbalā', refused and chose to perish on the battlefield.<sup>2</sup> The 'Irāqi tribes were not ready to fight on Muṣ'ab's side. Wellhausen observes: "The men of 'Irāq had no desire for battle, they had never been used to discipline and obedience, and the frightful party-struggle of the last years had not improved them; political and military loyalty were absolutely unknown to them".<sup>3</sup>

When 'Abd al-Malik was invading 'Irāq from Bājumaira they refused Muṣ'ab's appeals to advance against him,<sup>4</sup> showing the same indifference and unreliability they had displayed towards 'Alī's appeals in his war against Mu'āwiya.<sup>5</sup> But there were some, also, who

- 
1. Ansāb, V, 345; no doubt, 'Abd al-Malik also wished to weaken 'Abdallāh b. al-Zubair's prestige by having it seen that his own brother had forsaken him.
  2. Ansāb, V, 344.
  3. Wellhausen, p. 195; Cf. Murūj, III, 112, where the attitude of these tribes is described in much the same terms.
  4. Murūj, III, 112.
  5. Ya'qūbī, III, 140.

were prepared to fight to keep 'Irāq independent of Syria. Thus, Qais b. al-Haitham, when he felt that Muṣ'ab was losing the support of the people, appealed to their self-interest: "Do not let those Syrians invade your lands, for by God if you once let them taste your wealth, they will not stop until they have stripped you of everything".<sup>1</sup>

The earlier struggle between 'Alī and al-Zubair had left a feeling of bitterness against the latter's house among the Kūfans, and they were also displeased by the way Ibn al-Zubair was removing the wealth of the country to Ḥijāz, as had all the Caliphs, with the exception of 'Alī.<sup>2</sup> If Muṣ'ab was able for a while to command their loyalty, it was only because of their fear of the Syrians and the attitudes they had formed during the troubles with al-Mukhtār;<sup>3</sup> but even before the battle Suwaid b. Manjūf al-Sadūsī had warned Muṣ'ab of the unreliability of the Kūfans.<sup>4</sup> Baṣra,

---

1. Ṭabarī, VI, 157.

2. Ibid., VI, 11.

3. Of course, there were Kūfans who had supported al-Mukhtār, and these were hostile to Muṣ'ab because of the defeat he had inflicted upon them.

4. Ansāb, XI, 12.

too, was not disposed to give much support to Muṣ'ab; Rabī'a had revolted unsuccessfully only a year earlier. Azd, under the leadership of Ziyād b. 'Amr al-'Atakī, was prepared to support the Syrians, despite the warning given him by Aḥnaf b. Qais: "I fear you are bringing great ruin and destruction upon us. You will inflict the Syrian on us, who will kill us and occupy our lands. Beware!"<sup>1</sup> Ziyād replied to this that he felt that Muṣ'ab was hostile to him, in pretending that they would be ready to co-operate personally. The position taken by Azd was to influence many of the smaller tribes of Baṣra to adopt the same attitude.<sup>2</sup> After the death of Aḥnaf b. Qais 70/689, Tamīm, too, defected from allegiance to Muṣ'ab and refused to participate actively in the battle at Maskin.<sup>3</sup>

In the course of the battle Muṣ'ab was killed by a thrust of lance of Ziyād b. Qudāma al-Thaqafī, who cried out: Yā li-thārāti 'l-Mukhtār<sup>4</sup> - "Vengeance for al-Mukhtār". But such consideration of tribal honour and loyalty were probably not so influential as the bribes and promises of 'Abd al-Malik in determining the

---

1. Ansāb, V, 332.

2. Ansāb, VI, f.435.

3. Murūj, III, 116; Kūfī, II, f.100.

4. Ansāb, XI, 5.



attitudes of the tribes towards Muṣ'ab. 'Abdallāh b. al-Zubair had a reputation for meanness which was at odds with the Arab conception of true nobility, while 'Abd al-Malik was lavish in his promises of largesse to come.<sup>1</sup> The story is told that Muṣ'ab went to his brother 'Abdallāh in Mecca with a party of the leading men of 'Irāq for whom he asked certain sums of money. 'Abdallāh refused, calling these men the dregs of 'Irāq, and saying: "I will not give God's money to such as these".<sup>2</sup> Because of this refusal, it is said, the tribal leaders of 'Irāq wrote to 'Abd al-Malik offering their services, each of them requesting the governorship of Iṣbahān. Surprised at this, 'Abd al-Malik, exclaimed, "What is this Iṣbahān? Does it grow gold and silver? I have received forty letters about it!"<sup>3</sup> Nevertheless, he promised its governorship to every one who asked, including Ḥajjār b. Abjar, Ghaḍbān al-Qaba'tharī, 'Attāb b. Warqā', Qaṭan b. 'Abdallāh al-Ḥārithī and Muḥammad b. 'Umair.<sup>4</sup>

Moreover, he wrote to Aḥnaf b. Qais promising him

---

1. Imāma, II, 23.

2. Imāma, II, 20; Iqd, III, 98.

3. Ansāb, V, 337.

4. Ibid., VI, 438.

a governorship in Syria, but this was refused with disdain: Aḥnaf said: "How strange that Ibn al-Zarqā,<sup>1</sup> should ask me to befriend the Syrians and himself, when all I have ever wanted is that we should be separated by an impenetrable sea of fire. By God, I would rather die than see 'Irāq betrayed".<sup>2</sup> A letter was sent, also, to Ibrāhīm b. al-Ashtar, Muṣ'ab's best general and most faithful friend, offering him the lands watered by the Euphrates if he would come with his followers over to his side.<sup>3</sup> Ibrāhīm took the letter unopened to Muṣ'ab, warning him that many other tribal chiefs had received similar inducements and urging that he intimidate them into loyalty to himself. This Muṣ'ab was reluctant to do, for fear that these men would be supported by their tribes. Ibrāhīm then suggested that they be expelled to the Ḥijāz where Muṣ'ab's brother could keep them under control;<sup>4</sup> but this, too, was rejected because it was feared that by so doing he might give his brother the impression that he was unable to control the 'Irāqīs. Ibn A'tham explained the loyalty of Ibrāhīm to Muṣ'ab as arising out of his desire to keep 'Irāq in the hands

---

1. Ibn al-Zarqā' "the son of the strump~~e~~t", was a particularly bad form of abuse.

2. Ansāb, V, 88.

3. Dīnawarī, p. 302.

4. Ansāb, VI, 436; see, Imāma, II, 23.

of the tribes who first settled here, and because of the hostility he felt for Umayyads<sup>1</sup> - his father having been poisoned by Mu'āwiya.

Muṣ'ab's deputy in Kūfa, 'Amr b. Huraith al-Makhzumī, on the other hand, showed no loyalty whatever. He was in secret correspondence with 'Abd al-Malik, and came out of Kūfa with his troops to welcome him after Muṣ'ab had been defeated and slain. It is clear that the Zubairid's course had not been well received by the tribes of 'Irāq, who could see no benefit to themselves in participating in what was basically a struggle between the Quraish of the Hijāz and the Quraish of Syria.

#### The Governorship of al-Ḥajjāj

Although the Umayyads now had possession of 'Irāq, the transfer of power did nothing to solve the problems which had bedevilled it since the death of 'Alī. 'Abd al-Malik was aware of this, and fully realized that the attitude adopted by the tribes during his war with Muṣ'ab did not indicate friendship for himself so much as

---

1. Kūfī, II, f.65.

indifference towards both participants. In fact, there was a natural feeling of hostility towards Damascus in Kūfa, born of the resentment felt at having been displaced as the capital city of Islam. Bakr, from the federation of Rabi'a, nourished the traditional enmity towards Muḍar, and besides was virtually indigenous to lower 'Irāq long before the expansions began.

'Abd al-Malik sought to overcome this antipathy and indifference by suborning the prominent tribal leaders with lavish subsidies of money, and he left it to them to assure the compliance of their followers.<sup>1</sup> Thus, when Dāwūd b. Qaḥḍham, the leader of Bakr, noticed a lack of enthusiasm among his people for the Caliph, he brought two hundred from among them to Damascus to make a public profession of loyalty. After they had left, 'Abd al-Malik remarked that "None of these scoundrels would have paid me homage but for the example of their chief".<sup>2</sup> The support of Bakr was, of course, critical to his position in 'Irāq,<sup>3</sup> and at this juncture it was being aided by Azd. The fear of

---

1. Iqd, IV, 410.

2. Ṭabarī, VII, 189.

هوؤلاء الفساق لولا ان صاحبهم جاءني  
ما أعطاني أحد منهم طاعته

3. Ishtiqāq, p. 359.

growing Syrian influence showed these two tribes the advantage of presenting a united front.

After the situation in 'Irāq had been stabilized, 'Abd al-Malik lost no time in transferring a large section of Azd northwards to Mouṣil where his brother, Muḥammad b. Marwān, was governor.<sup>1</sup> Another brother, Bishr b. Marwān, was appointed governor of Kūfa in 73/692; and some time later, when Khālīd b. 'Abdallāh b. Asīd was dismissed from Baṣra, this too was included in his authority.<sup>2</sup> However, his period of office was not successful, mainly because he failed to understand the true nature of the situation he found himself in, and had not the resolution to deal firmly with the tribes. During his time the quarters (arbā') of Kūfa were re-distributed; one was assigned to Medīna (ahl al-Medīna), another to Tamīm and Hamdān; a third to Kinda and Rabī'a; and the last to Madhḥij and Asad.<sup>3</sup> The reason behind this grouping together of northern and southern tribes is not clear; it may be that he wished to locate in one place groups that had traditional hostility towards one another which would prevent them from uniting

---

1. Ya'qūbī, III, 18.

2. Ansāh, IV, ii, 159.

3. Tabarī, VI, 197.



against himself.

Only the cities of Baṣra and Kūfa were really under any form of effective control at this time, and here the tribes were always a potential menace; in the countryside, it was the Khārijites who held power.<sup>1</sup> And this was the situation that al-Ḥajjāj, the most famous of all Umayyad viceroys, was sent to cope with in 75/694. His letter of appointment from 'Abd al-Malik concludes with the words: "I have made Kūfa a present to you; stamp on it so hard that Baṣra will tremble. Don't think you can behave as you did in the Ḥijāz; there the people talk a lot but do nothing".<sup>2</sup> Thus he arrived here with virtually unlimited powers, and he was prepared to use these to the full to secure the territory firmly for his masters. The fact that such unlimited powers were conferred on a governor must be taken as an indication of the anxiety felt by Damascus about the situation in 'Irāq, and it was fortunate that such a faithful and able servant as

---

1. Ṭabarī, VI, 198.

2. Ansāb, VI, 240; Ya'qūbī, III, 116.

يا حجاج قد أعطيتك الكوفة صدقة فطأها وطأة يتضاءل منها  
أهل البصرة، وإياك وهوبنا الحجاز فإن القائل هناك  
يقول ألفا ولا يفعل حرفاً.

al-Ḥajjāj was on hand to represent its interest here.<sup>1</sup>

The famous story of al-Ḥajjāj's address to the people of Kūfa from the pulpit of the mosque is, of course, part of the fiction which invariably attaches to men of extraordinary ability in Islamic history, and should be regarded as an attempt to refer his subsequent activities to the very beginning of his governorship.<sup>2</sup> What seems most likely is that he took advantage of the tribal hostilities which were rife at the time of his arrival to prevent any united opposition to himself, at the same time playing on their fears of the Khārijites in the vicinity so that they would look to him for their security.<sup>3</sup> Although the repression of the Khawārij is accounted among the greatest of al-Ḥajjāj's successes, it should be noted that it was this threat to the two cities that gave the new governor an immediate political objective in which

1. This is the reputation of al-Ḥajjāj that passed into the traditional histories; cf. for example, Murūj, III, 206.
2. The account is found in Ṭabarī, VI, 202, where the chain of narration goes back to 'Omar b. Shabba.
3. Examples of the terrorism of certain of the Khawārij at this time are numerous in the sources; Cf. Ṭabarī, VI, pp. 196, 240; Aghānī, VI, 142. A summary of the situation is to be found in Murūj, III, 133, and Dīnawarī, pp. 279-284.

the tribes could share and identify their own interests with those of their rulers. Moreover, the warfare against this menace gave him a pretext for moving much of the tribal strength out of the cities.

His first encounter with tribal intractability came when 'Umair b. Dābi' of Tamīm refused to join al-Muhallab in a campaign against the Khawārij because of his advanced age. This 'Umair was one of the party that had murdered 'Uthmān b. 'Affān,<sup>1</sup> which would have been a further reason for al-Ḥajjāj's hostility towards him. He suffered death for this refusal. This, however, is the only instance of disobedience recorded for the year 75/694, the other tribes apparently being prepared to co-operate despite their previous attitudes of resistance to authority. For example Madhḥij sent four thousand men to al-Muhallab's army.<sup>2</sup>

The next measure of punishment he meted out came when he visited the always-turbulent city of Baṣra, and the occasion for it was very much the same as in Kūfa. Sharīk b. 'Amr al-Yashkurī, of Bakr, refused to go out

---

1. Aghānī, XIV, 245; Bad', VI, 31.

2. Ṭabarī, VI, 207. Madhḥij had not only been prominent in the support of 'Alī, but being of southern origin it could not have looked with favour on its northern governor.

to fight the Azāriqa (the Khārijites of Baṣra), making the excuse that he was suffering from a rupture; he met the same end as 'Umair b. Dābi'.<sup>1</sup>

By these killings al-Ḥajjāj alienated some of the most powerful tribes in each of the two cities, and this was to hinder the exercise of his authority as governor of the East. He further angered the Baṣrans by reducing the 'aṭā' from the amount it had been under Muṣ'ab b. al-Zubair and Bishr b. Marwān,<sup>2</sup> and refused to listen when they protested against this.<sup>3</sup> And so in 76/695 the tribes of the city joined together in a revolt which broke out in Rustaqabādh under the leadership of 'Abdallāh b. al-Jārūd, a leader of 'Abd al-Qais, and in this Tamīm, led by al-Hudhail b. 'Imrān al-Burjumī and 'Abdallāh b. al-Ḥakam al-Mujāshi'ī participated. The object of the revolt was to get rid of al-Ḥajjāj and the severe measures he had been using against them,<sup>4</sup> but it also seems that personal grievances were held against him by the leaders. The Bakr tribes of Kūfa, led by Ghadḥān al-Qaba'tharī al-Shaibānī,<sup>5</sup>

1. Kāmil, IV, 158.

2. Ansāb, XI, 281; Kāmil, IV, 158.

3. Ansāb, XI, 280. قال: الزيادة التي زادكم إيّاها ابن

الزبير إنّما هي زيادة ملحد منافق فاسق ولسنا نجيزها.

4. Ibid., XI, 281.

5. The only sources to mention Ghadḥān al-Qaba'tharī as the leader of the Bakr of Kūfa at this time is al-Jumahī, Ṭabaqāt, p. 401; the name occurs in other sources, but only as a prominent individual in al-Jumahī.

joined in the revolt with their fellow-tribesmen of Baṣra, who were nominally under the leadership of Manjūf al-Sadūsī; whether the latter himself was involved in the uprising is not clear.

Ibn al-Jārūd gained all but complete control of Baṣra, and al-Ḥajjāj was contemplating fleeing to Syria. One of his wives had been kidnapped by the Yemenites, and another by the Muḍarites.<sup>1</sup> He was refused help by 'Ubaidallāh b. Ka'b al-Numairī, the leader of Ahl al-'Āliya, while the only comfort Ziyād b. 'Amr al-'Atakī of Azd, who tried to maintain a neutral position, could offer was to suggest that al-Ḥajjāj should allow him to seek a safe-conduct from the revolutionaries so that he could leave 'Irāq. This was characteristic of Ziyād, who is always found favouring whichever side happened to be the strongest in a given conflict; and now he clearly wanted to retain the good-will of both al-Ḥajjāj and the rebels.<sup>2</sup> In this case, however, he deceived himself, for al-Ḥajjāj refused his offer to mediate and denounced his

---

1. Ansāb, XI, 282.

2. The Ansāb, XI, pp. 281-286, is the chief source for these events, and has been followed by Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, IV, 159. Ṭabarī, VI, 210 and Ibn Qutaiba, Ma'ārīf, p. 115, treat the situation very summarily.



unwillingness to commit himself.

How al-Ḥajjāj was able to overcome these difficulties and restore his position is very inadequately explained by the sources. It is clear that he did have some local support: 'Uthmān b. Qaṭan al-Ḥārithī urged him to fight the rebels, and it would seem that certain sections of Qais, too, took his side.<sup>1</sup> The al-Ḥabiṭāt of Tamīm, who were in conflict with other members of their tribe, came over to his side under the leadership of 'Abbād b. al-Ḥuṣain al-Ḥabaṭī. Later, Azd found it prudent to offer their support for they feared for their own position at the hands of Rabī'a if al-Ḥajjāj were expelled.<sup>2</sup> Qutaiba b. Muslim al-Bāhilī, the head of the clan of A'ṣur of Qais, remained loyal because al-Ḥajjāj was from Thaqīf, another clan of Qais, and both nourished hostility against 'Abd al-Qais of Rabī'a.<sup>3</sup>

In the battle which took place between the two factions, Ibn al-Jārūd was killed by an arrow, whereupon the troops which had been supporting him dispersed, giving the victory to al-Ḥajjāj. This took place in

---

1. Kāmil, IV, 150.

2. Ansāb, XI, 283.

3. Ibid., XI, 287.

the year 76/695, and was the first of the crises which al-Ḥajjāj had to surmount.<sup>1</sup>

### The Revolt of Ibn al-Ash'ath

The 'Irāqīs submitted to the vigorous control exercised over them by al-Ḥajjāj until 82/701, when a revolt of unprecedented size again broke out. It was led by 'Abdal-Rahmān b. Muḥammad b. al-Ash'ath, who, according to Abū Mikhnaḥ, had been governor of Sīstān. While there, he was ordered by al-Ḥajjāj to launch a campaign against Rutbīl, the ruler of Zabulistān to the east, in retaliation for a defeat he had previously inflicted on the Arabs.<sup>2</sup>

Ibn A'tham reports that Ibn al-Ash'ath's predecessor in Sīstān, Umayya b. 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Khālīd b. Asīd, had been ordered by al-Ḥajjāj to lead a raid on Kābul, however he met with such determined resistance from Rutbīl that he was obliged to sue for peace. Because of this failure al-Ḥajjāj dismissed him from his governorship of the region, appointing in his place

---

1. This is the date found in the sources deriving from the Ansāb al-Ashraf, XI, 282, e.g., Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, IV, 160; however, Khālīfa, Ta'rīkh, I, 347, places it in 75/694, and he is followed by Tabarī, VI,

2. Tabarī, VI, 327.

‘Ubaid-allāh b. Abī Bakra, who was instructed to launch another attack on Kabul. This was no more successful than the previous one; he sent out 10,000 Kūfans under the leadership of Shuraiḥ b. Hānī al-Ḥārithī, and in the engagement with Rutbīl this army was destroyed and Shuraiḥ himself slain. It was now that Ibn al-Ash‘ath was sent to Sīstān, and he was specifically charged to exact vengeance for the losses which Rutbīl had inflicted on the Arabs.<sup>1</sup>

Ibn Khayyāt places the appointment of ‘Ubaid allāh b. Abī Bakra in the year 78/697, and says that it was the latter's son, Abū Barda‘a, who lead the disastrous campaign against Rutbīl mentioned above.<sup>2</sup> In the account of Abū Mikhnaf, Ibn al-Ash‘ath had first been sent to Kirmān to quell the rebellion of its governor, Himyān b. Adī al-Sadūsī; and when ‘Ubaidallāh b. Abī Bakra died, he was transferred from here to Sistān.<sup>3</sup>

The affairs of the East were always of deep concern to al-Ḥajjāj; and after the defeat of Shuraiḥ's Kūfans, he immediately collected a new army of 40,000 men from Kūfa and Baṣra, upon the equipping of which

---

1. Kūfī, II, ff.126-128.

2. Khalīfa, I, 356.

3. Ṭabarī, VI, 329.

he spent so much money that it was known as the Army of Peacocks (Jaish al-ṭawāwīs). To the leadership of this army he appointed Ibn al-Ash'ath who, despite the account of Abū Mikhnaḥ mentioned above, seems to have been in 'Irāq at this time.<sup>1</sup> The army moved into Sīstān, but apparently it did not show the energy in attacking Rutbīl which al-Ḥajjāj had wished and expected, and his reaction was characteristically direct and blunt. In a letter to Ibn al-Ash'ath, who had been writing to him about the need for patience and circumspection in such a dangerous enterprise, he said: "Your letter is that of a sluggard, anxious for his peace and ease. Get on with the task you were charged with and invade the enemies' lands! Otherwise, your brother Ishāq b. Muḥammad will replace you as governor".<sup>2</sup>

Abū Mikhnaḥ presents this as the immediate cause of the revolt of Ibn al-Ash'ath, but it is clear that there were deep underlying forces in 'Irāq itself which brought about the situation, most notably the struggle for supremacy between the two large confederations of Muḍar and Yemen.

---

1. Tabarī, VI, 327.

2. Ibid., VI, pp. 334-5.

Although the Yemenites could boast of a long history of settled civilization in the south of Arabia and considered themselves superior to the nomadic Muḍar, it was from the latter that the chief posts of government had been filled ever since the emergence of Islam. The Muḍar claimed this privilege because it was from among them that the Prophet had come, and since then it had been accepted that his successors, too, should be from Quraish. The Muḍarite Khālīd b. Ṣafwān expresses this sentiment in the words: "The Prophet is from us, the Book is among us, and the Caliph will be from us". There was a saying current: "The Jāhiliyya is the Yemen's, Islām belongs to Muḍar".<sup>1</sup> Despite these pretensions in the amṣār, the Qaḥṭānite tribes were able to challenge the supremacy of Muḍar; and the various governors of 'Irāq had been of both origins, depending on the policies of Damascus.<sup>2</sup> There, the Caliph was forced to maintain a certain ambivalence in order to hold together the two elements on which his power had to be based, but his governors in 'Irāq had until this

---

1. Iqd, III, 330.

2. Thus, 'Abd al-Malik, al-Walīd and Sulaimān all had the loyalty of Āl-al-Muhallab, of Yemen; this family provided the local leadership against the Khawārij in 'Irāq. Ma'ārif, p. 137; Dīnawarī, p. 286.



time been exclusively from Muḍar and were free to favour their own kinsmen so long as this proved effective in keeping the province peaceful.

The revolt of Ibn al-Ash'ath can be seen as a massive effort on the part of Yemeni's to break this Muḍarite domination in 'Irāq; and, indeed, they formed the majority of the Arabs in the territory. It was not only against al-Ḥajjāj that the revolt was directed, but against Syria and the Caliph himself. Thus, Ibn al-Ash'ath assumed the title Nāṣir al-Mu'minīn, and presented himself as the leader who would save the Qaḥṭānites and restore their ancient Kingdom.<sup>1</sup>

The regional feelings involved were epitomized in the position taken by Rabī'a; led by Biṣṭām b. Maṣqala b. Hubaira al-Shaibānī, it joined Ibn al-Ash'ath out of its long-standing enmity towards the Arabs of Syria in general and towards Muḍar in particular.<sup>2</sup> And there were, also, those who resented the rule of a man such as al-Ḥajjāj who, compared to Ibn al-Ash'ath, was of mean and inglorious origins and who was seen as

1. Tanbīh, p. 272; Bad', VI, 35. Not to be outdone by Muḍar, the Yemenites, too, claimed to have produced many Prophets; although this does not figure in the polemic which occurred at this time. Cf. Iklīl, VIII, pp. 158-160.

2. Tabarī, VI, 359.

the hireling of the tyrants in Damascus and a reproach against the ancient glories of Kinda.<sup>1</sup> Others, it would appear, resented domination by the men of Thaqīf whom al-Ḥajjāj was placing in positions of power,<sup>2</sup> whereas 'Irāqīs were being conscripted into the armies that were being sent to distant frontier territories and kept there apart from their families.<sup>3</sup> 'Abd al-Mu'min b. Shabath b. Rib'ī, whose father had formerly opposed al-Mukhtār in Kūfa, is reported to have warned the troops stationed in Sīstān that if they remained loyal to al-Ḥajjāj they would be left there until they died, and they would never see their loved ones again.<sup>4</sup>

The pious people ('ubbād, zuhād and gurrā' are the terms used), also, were alienated from al-Ḥajjāj by the violence of his nature, and their support was

---

1. Aghānī, VI, 46, where A'shā Hamdān compares the qualities of al-Ḥajjāj and Ibn al-Ash'ath.

يأبى الإله وعزة ابن محمد وجدود ملك قبل آل شمود  
ان تأنسوا بمذممين عروقههم في الناس إن نسبوا عروقه عبيد

2. When Qutaiba b. Muslim asked Biṣṭām b. Masqala to help al-Ḥajjāj in this struggle against the rebels, he received the answer, "I would rather die with the 'Irāqīs than live with the Syrians". Ṭabarī, VI, 359.

3. Mubarrad, II, 430. The term for such conscription was tajmīr.

4. Kāmil, IV, 191.

lent to Ibn al-Ash'ath,<sup>1</sup> one report stating that the latter's army contained eight thousand such men who believed they were actually participating in a jihād!<sup>2</sup> They occupied the foremost ranks of the army in the battle, angered that the Sunna had been murdered, the law had been desecrated, and the lives of the people taken wholesale.

Personal animosity between Ibn al-Ash'ath and al-Hajjāj is, also, said to have brought about the revolution. Dīnawarī reports that al-Hajjāj used the words: "I have never seen Ibn al-Ash'ath without wanting to kill him";<sup>3</sup> and Ibn Qutaiba states that the only reason Ibn al-Ash'ath was placed in command of the army of Sīstān was to test his loyalty.<sup>4</sup> To Ibn Ash'ath, also, is attributed a similar aversion and vindictiveness; apparently he felt that the governorship of 'Irāq should have been his.<sup>5</sup>

---

1. Tabarī, VI, 343; Murūj, III, 152.

2. Kūfī, II, f.142; the support given by the pietists is, also, alluded to in Murūj, III, 152, and Bad', VI, 35.

3. Dīnawarī, p. 307.

4. As against this statement by Ibn Qutaiba, Ibn A'tham relates that al-Hajjāj actually had great confidence in Ibn al-Ash'ath, and when even the latter's brothers warned him that he was disloyal, he refused to believe them. Kūfī, II, f.128.

5. Kūfī, II, f.124.

Abū Mikhnaḥ numbers the army of Ibn Ash'ath's supporters at over one hundred thousand,<sup>1</sup> and other fictions of the type common to such events are, also, dragged in: Ibn al-Ash'ath forged a letter purported to be from al-Ḥajjāj to himself, in which he was instructed to kill all the leaders of the army. He showed this letter to the generals in question, and as a consequence they, too, became the enemies of al-Ḥajjāj.<sup>2</sup> With his army Ibn al-Ash'ath marched towards 'Irāq.

'Abd al-Malik was now confronted with a dangerous problem, nothing less than the mass defection of the army on which his power rested in the East. So distracted was he that al-Isfahānī says he even forgot to appoint an amīr al-ḥaj for that year,<sup>3</sup> while Ibn A'tham had him suffering from nightmares which left him sleepless.<sup>4</sup>

He sent emissaries to negotiate with the rebels, and showed himself prepared to sacrifice al-Ḥajjāj if this could bring about peace in the region. Furthermore he engaged to withdraw all the Syrian troops and promised

---

1. Ṭabarī, VI, 347.

2. Kūfī, II, f.129.

3. Aghānī, III, 104.

4. Kūfī, II, f.135.

that never again would a Syrian be appointed governor. His attempts at conciliation were rejected and the war continued.<sup>1</sup>

To oppose the rebels, large numbers of troops were collected from Syria and al-Jazīra - amounting to seventy thousand we are told by Ibn A'tham - and after eighty encounters more or less preliminary in nature, the final and decisive battle was fought at Dair al-Jamājim in 82/701.<sup>2</sup> Ibn al-Ash'ath was defeated, mainly because he was deserted by his Baṣran contingents who, once they had arrived in their city, went off to join their wives and children and refused to remain with the army. Ibn 'Awn, an eyewitness, relates that he saw Ibn al-Ash'ath in Baṣra threatening those who had defected.<sup>3</sup> The second, and probably the most important, reason for his defeat was the superiority in numbers of the Syrian army, but since all the figures supplied in the sources are doubtful, this must remain an assumption.

In consequence of this abortive revolt, the Umayyad military grip on 'Irāq was strengthened. In

---

1. Kāmil, IV, 194.

2. Kūfī, II, f.141.

3. Khalīfa, I, 363.



the year 83/702, al-Ḥajjāj built Wāsiṭ as a garrison city for his Syrian troops,<sup>1</sup> where they would be kept separate from local influences. No one was allowed to enter it without his permission.<sup>2</sup>

Yemenite control of 'Irāq after the death  
of al-Ḥajjāj

With the death of al-Ḥajjāj in 95/713, the domination of Qais through the branch of Thaqīf came to an end. It had lasted for twenty years, supported by both 'Abd al-Malik (66/685 - 86/705) and his son al-Walīd (86/705 - 96/714). However, when Sulaiman b. 'Abd al-Malik (96/714 - 99/717) came to the throne, circumstances in 'Irāq changed completely; he had achieved power with the assistance of the Yemenīs and now he had to reward them for their support. He himself, like his brother al-Walīd, had a Qaisite mother,<sup>3</sup> and presumably would have shared the same feeling of preference towards them; however, when it became apparent that al-Walīd was seeking, with the consent of the

---

1. Tabarī, VIII, pp. 36-37; Kāmil, IV, pp. 205-205.

2. Aghānī, VIII, 75.

3. Naqā'id, I, 384; Kāmil, V, 15. Sulaiman's mother was from 'Abs.

Qaisites to have his own son 'Abd al-'Azīz designated to succeed himself and thereby deprive Sulaimān from the throne, the latter was forced to look elsewhere for support. Al-Ḥajjāj, apparently, favoured al-Walīd in these arrangements: he was trying to make in regard to the succession, and consequently was regarded by Sulaimān as an adversary. The story goes that al-Ḥajjāj was fearful for his own safety should Sulaimān ever attain the Caliphate, and that he prayed that he might die before such a day came.

Al-Ḥajjāj's successor was Yazīd b. Abī Muslim, but in 96/714, shortly after Sulaimān came to the throne, he was replaced by the Yemenite Yazīd b. al-Muhallab.<sup>2</sup> Now the men of al-Muhallab, who were the foremost family of Azd, supplanted Thaqīf in the administration of 'Irāq. A close friendship is said to have existed between Sulaimān and Yazīd b. al-Muhallab,<sup>3</sup> and the latter, too, is presented as being hostile to al-Ḥajjāj due to certain acts of injustice he had suffered at his hands.<sup>4</sup>

---

1. Ṭabarī, VI, 497.

2. Ya'qūbī, III, 33; Jahshiyārī, p. 49.

3. Jahshiyārī, p. 50; Apparently each gave preference to the other in seating arrangements!

4. Ṭabarī, VI, 448; Kāmil, IV, 207.

But the fact is that there was no more respected family of Yemenī descent in ‘Irāq than that of al-Muhallab, and as Sulaimān had committed himself to these tribes in his struggle for the throne, it was natural that it was to them he would turn once he had achieved power. His selection was, also, welcomed by the people of the province, for Yazīd b. al-Muhallab was regarded as a man who took their interests to heart. For example, when Sulaimān designated his powers as governor as being both financial and military - i.e. he was to collect the Kharāj as well as maintain the peace - he refused to accept the first of these duties. He argued that al-Ḥajjāj had made such exactions on the people that they could not continue to pay at the rate he used to demand; to force them to do so would be to excite their hatred and discontent.<sup>1</sup>

Yazīd appointed Sufyān b. ‘Abdallāh al-Kindī governor of Baṣra; Ḥarmala b. ‘Umair al-Laithī of Kūfa, to be replaced later by Bashīr b. Ḥassān al-Nahdī; and al-Jarrāḥ b. ‘Abdallāh al-Ḥakamī (from Sa‘d al-‘Ashīra) of Wāsiṭ.<sup>2</sup> Despite the affection he seems to

---

1. Ṭabarī, VI, 523; Jahshiyārī, p. 49.

2. These appointments are mentioned in Ṭabarī, VI, pp. 522, 529; for al-Jarrāḥ's connection with Sa‘d al-‘Ashīra, Cf. Ishtiqāq, p. 405.

have had for 'Irāq and its people, Yazīd himself felt more at home in Khurāsān, where he had spent many years of his life; and in 98/716 Sulaiman appointed him governor of this region, as well as 'Irāq.<sup>1</sup>

The influence of the Muhallabites lasted only as long as Sulaimān held the Caliphate; when he was succeeded in 99/717 by 'Omar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz, their fortunes went into a gradual decline. The usual stories of personal enmity between the new Caliph and Yazīd are to be found in the sources; among others that Yazīd had previously written in a letter to Sulaimān about the vast sums of money he had collected in Khurāsān. 'Omar got possession of this letter and demanded that this wealth be sent to the treasury; Yazīd protested that he was merely boasting and did not really have money in such amounts. 'Omar refused to believe this, and had Yazīd recalled to Damascus where he was thrown into prison.<sup>2</sup>

Yazīd contrived to escape from prison, either towards the end of 'Omar's life, according to Abū Mikhnaf,<sup>3</sup> or after his death in 101/719, according to al-Wāqidī.<sup>4</sup> The former account is supported by al-Azdī

---

1. Jahshiyārī, p. 49.

2. Ṭabarī, VI, 557; cf. also, Kūfī, II, f.188.

3. Ṭabarī, VI, 564; Murūj, III, 210.

4. Ṭabarī, VI, 565; Bad', IV, 47.

who relates that Yazīd wrote a letter to the Caliph after his escape in which he explains that he would not have fled his captivity if he could have been certain that 'Omar would survive his illness. However, he was greatly afraid of what would happen to himself when Yazīd b. 'Abd al-Malik succeeded to the Caliphate.<sup>1</sup>

The hostility between Yazīd b. 'Abd al-Malik and Yazīd b. al-Muhallab went back to the time when the Caliph Sulaimān appointed Ibn al-Muhallab to punish the Banū 'Uqail of Thaqīf, the family of al-Ḥajjāj, to whom Yazīd b. 'Abd al-Malik was related by marriage. The latter pleaded for mercy to be shown to the Banū 'Uqail, but Ibn al-Muhallab refused to listen to intercession. And so Yazīd b. 'Abd al-Malik swore vengeance on Ibn al-Muhallab should the opportunity ever present itself. Such is the story supplied to account for the events which were to take place in 'Irāq.<sup>2</sup>

Yazīd Ibn al-Muhallab went to Baṣra where his own tribe of Azd and their ally Rabī'a held the dominant position; and among these tribes no family was more

---

1. Azdī, II, 3.

2. Khalīfa, II, 3; Ṭabarī, VI, 564.



prominent than that of al-Muhallab. Al-Hamdānī mentions it among the four illustrious families of Baṣra, to which Kūfa could show nothing similar,<sup>1</sup> while the poet Ḥammād 'Ajrad writes:

Marwān is the family of Syria, without a rival,  
And al-Muhallab is the family of the 'Irāqīs.<sup>2</sup>

Yazīd himself used to vaunt the fact that he was of Azd and Rabī'a were their allies.<sup>3</sup>

In 102/719, Yazīd b. al-Muhallab revolted in 'Irāq seizing Baṣra and placing its Qaisite governor 'Adī b. Arṭāt al-Fazārī under arrest.<sup>4</sup> In response to the oath of allegiance (bay'a) given to him by the tribes, he promised that he would rule by the Qur'ān and Sunna of the Prophet, and would strive to free the land from occupation by the troops of the enemy (i.e. the Syrians), and from the government of evil men such as al-Ḥajjāj.<sup>5</sup> There was, also, an economic motive behind his revolt, as becomes clear from the address he made to the people after capturing Wāsiṭ: "Our country is a nourishing morsel for the Syrian mouth; the only way we can recover it is by violence against

---

1. Faqīh, p. 190.

2. Wakī', II, 169.

3. 'Uyūn, I, 291.

4. Murūj, III, 210.

5. Ṭabarī, VI, 592.

them".<sup>1</sup> Ever since the time of 'Alī b. Abī Tālib, it had been the wish of the 'Irāqīs to escape the economic exploitation of Syria, and the support received now by Yazīd was but another manifestation of this. And there was the ever-present wish of the Yemenīs to exclude Qaisite influence from a region which they had been defending from such menaces as the Khawārij.<sup>2</sup>

The response to Yazīd's revolt in Baṣra was mixed: not all the branches of Rabī'a supported him, despite the traditional alliance of this tribe with Azd. During the revolt, they did not as a whole rally to his side, and certain sections refused to play any part until they had received presents and bribes in excess of what the Umayyad governor of Baṣra, 'Adī b. Arṭāt al-Fazārī, had given them.<sup>3</sup> Sections of Azd, also, withheld their support: a group led by al-Mughīra b. Ziyād b. 'Amr al-'Atakī had a long-standing feud with the family of al-Muhallab, but in addition al-Mughīra had recently been appointed by the governor as a head of the Khums of Azd and was virtually an Umayyad employee.<sup>4</sup> Like

---

1. Bayān, I, 410.

2. Ansāb, V, 426. Mention is made of a certain Azdite who even went so far as to address Yazīd as Amīr al-Mu'minīn. Cf. Ḥamāsa, I, 179.

3. Ṭabarī, VI, 581; Aghānī, XIV, 280, where Thābit Quṭna of Azd satirized Rabī'a in verse.

4. Kāmil, V, 29.

his father before him, he seems to have been motivated more by self-interest than by tribal or political loyalty.

Most of Tamīm and Qais, joined together under the leadership of Muḥriz b. Ḥumrān al-Sa'dī from the Minqar branch of the former tribe, were against Yazīd;<sup>1</sup> while the Banū Mujāshi' regarded him as an enemy because he had killed al-Khiyār b. Sabra al-Mujāshi'ī, the governor of 'Umān.<sup>2</sup> A section of Bakr, under 'Imrān b. 'Āmir b. Misma' came over to Yazīd for the selfish reason that one of his cousins had been appointed to the leadership of the tribe by 'Adī b. Arṭāt instead of himself.<sup>3</sup> The section of Bakr which opposed Yazīd was presumably less numerous than 'Imrān's faction, in as much as the sources fail to mention its composition and leadership.

Yazīd was also opposed by 'Abd al-Qais, led at this time by Mālik b. al-Mundhir b. al-Jārūd, and it was joined in this opposition by Ahl al-'Āliya (including Quraish, Kināna, Bajīla, Khath'am and the whole of Qais 'Aylān) under the leadership of 'Abd al-A'lā b. 'Abdallāh b. 'Āmir al-Quraishī.<sup>4</sup> These alliances

---

1. Ṭabarī, VI, 579.

2. Naqā'id, II, 974.

3. Ṭabarī, VI, 580.

4. Kāmil, V, 29.

for and against Yazīd b. al-Muhallab were for the most part prompted by the personal jealousies and rivalries of the leaders, and opposition to him should not be taken to indicate any sympathy for the Syrians.

In Kūfa the support for Ibn al-Muhallab was, by contrast, whole-hearted and total, the revolt affording the people of the city <sup>an opportunity</sup> to renew their open hostility to the Syrians. The severe repressive measures taken against the Kūfans, by successive Umayyad governors, and their exclusion from the administration of what they regarded as their own province, kept alive the feelings of hatred and the desire for revenge.<sup>1</sup> All quarters of the city rallied to the support of the rebel cause: the quarter of Ahl al-Medīna, led by ‘Abdallāh b. Sufyān al-Azdī; the quarter of Madhḥij, led by al-Nu‘mān b. Ibrāhīm b. al-Ashtar al-Nakha‘ī; the quarter of Rabī‘a, led by Muḥammad b. Ishāq b. Muḥammad b. al-Ash‘ath; and the quarter of Tamīm and Hamdān, led by Ḥanzala b. ‘Attāb b. Warqā’ al-Tamīmī.<sup>2</sup> All these tribal leaders were the descendants of men who in their day, too, had resisted the Umayyad occupation of ‘Irāq.

The personal animosity between Yazīd b. al-Muhallab and the Caliph Yazīd b. ‘Abd al-Malik did not

---

1. Ansāb, V, pp. 240-241; Bad’, VI, 5.

2. Tabarī, VI, pp. 591-592. The Rabī‘a in Kūfa played a prominent rôle in this revolt; cf. Azdī, II, 12.

go unnoticed in the province. The pious al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī warned the people of Baṣra who were supporting the rebel about becoming involved in a struggle which did not really concern them: "Only yesterday, Ibn al-Muhallab was himself killing the people of 'Irāq in order to please the Banū Marwān".<sup>1</sup> This should be borne in mind when we find Yazīd claiming that he was fighting for the purity of the religion, and that in this respect jihād against the Syrians would have greater reward in the hereafter than war with the Daylamites and the Turks.<sup>2</sup>

Baṣra fell to Yazīd after a brief attempt at resistance; Kūfa welcomed him wholeheartedly and was followed in this by Wāsiṭ. He sent governors out to take over the administration of Ahwāz, Fārs and Kirmān.<sup>3</sup> He, also, wished to send his brother Mudrik to Khurāsān in the same capacity, but the Tamīm of that province prevented this, and it is said that they were encouraged in their resistance by the governor, 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Nu'aim al-Azdī, who did not want to lose his own position.<sup>4</sup>

---

1. Wakī', I, 308.

2. Ṭabarī, VI, 581; Azdī, II, 9.

3. Ṭabarī, VI, 585.

4. Azdī, II, 8. Certain of the Azd in the province favoured the arrival of Mudrik, but they were afraid that his presence would stir up trouble with the local Tamīm, so they urged him to return and wait until his brother held undisputed control of 'Irāq.



Despite the importance of this revolt and its implications for Umayyad influence in the province, the information given in the sources is scant and lacking in clarity. It is reasonable to assume that it was the unstable character of most Arab tribal alliances that accounts for Yazīd's failure; given the reluctance which Baṣra showed towards his appeal, it must be recognized that he did not lead a united province. The large army sent from Syria under the command of Maslama b. 'Abd al-Malik, on the other hand, was a united force. Moreover, the half-heartedness of many of Yazīd's supporters made them receptive to the promises and cajolements of the Umayyad leaders.<sup>1</sup>

After the victory of the Syrians at the battle of al-'Aqr (102/720), 'Irāq was again brought under strict Umayyad control, and the rebellious Yemenī tribes in the province - and in particular Azd - were severely punished. The Muhallabite family was singled out for persecution; those of them who fled were pursued

---

1. Murūj, III, 210; Aghānī, XIV, 278; Shi'r, II, 613. All three quote the verses of Thābit Quṭna in explanation of Yazīd's failure:

كُلُّ الْقَبَائِلِ بِأَيْعُوكَ عَلَى السَّيِّئِ      تَدْعُو إِلَيْهِ وَتَتَّبِعُوكَ وَسَارُوا  
 حَتَّى إِذَا حَمَى الْوَعْيَى وَجَعَلَتْهُمْ      نَصَبَ الْأَسِنَّةِ أَسْلَمُوكَ وَطَارُوا  
 أَنْ يَقْتُلُوكَ فَإِنَّ قَتْلَكَ لَمْ يَكُنْ      عَارًا عَلَيْكَ وَبَعْضُ قَتْلِ عَارٍ

and brought to Damascus to receive their deserts.

These acts of repression further embittered the 'Irāqīs against the Syrians. The saying ran: The Banū Ḥarb sacrificed the religion on the Day of Karbalā' when they killed al-Ḥusain b. 'Alī; and the Banū Marwān sacrificed decency (murū'a) on the Day of al-'Aqr, when Yazīd b. al-Muhallab was slain.

#### The Second Period of Qaisite Control in 'Irāq

The retaliatory measures taken by the Umayyads once they had re-established themselves in 'Irāq were not confined to Yemenī tribes. Those of Muḍar, also, suffered their reprisals, and in particular Tamīm, despite the fact that certain groups of the latter had been very reluctant in <sup>the</sup> support they gave to the rebellion, and had even defected on the day of battle.<sup>1</sup>

Maslama b. 'Abd al-Malik was appointed governor of 'Irāq, but was deposed in less than a year because he was not forwarding the revenues of the province to Damascus.<sup>2</sup> He was succeeded by 'Omar b. Hubaira al-Fazārī (103/721 - 105/723), a fanatical Qaisite who so

---

1. Tabarī, VIII, pp. 156-160.

2. Kāmil, V, pp. 36, 40.

persecuted the Yemenīs, and in particular the Azdites, that even Mudar were moved to protest.<sup>1</sup> What the region needed was a spirit of conciliation, and his measures were only exacerbating latent grievances.

The death of the Caliph Yazīd b. 'Abd al-Malik in 105/723, and the accession of Hishām b. 'Abd al-Malik (105/723 - 125/742) brought an end to Qaisite domination in 'Irāq, and efforts were made to placate Yemenī sentiment. 'Omar b. Hubaira was replaced as a governor by the Yemenite Khālīd b. 'Abdallāh al-Qasrī (105/723 - 120/737).<sup>2</sup> It was Hishām's purpose to restore the economic stability of the Empire, and this clearly could not be done if the provinces were seething with discontent and resentment.

Khālīd did not allow his Yemenite origin to influence his treatment of the other tribes, either because of Hishām's policy of conciliation or because his own particular tribe was not strong enough in 'Irāq

- 
1. The verses of al-Farazdaq (Shi'r, I, 24; Jumahī, p. 289; Aghānī, XIX, 17; etc.) describe him satirically:

أمير المؤمنين وأنت عفا	كريم ليس بالطبع الحريص
أوليت العراق ورافديته	فزاريا أخذ يد القميص
ولم يك قبلها راعي مخاض	ليأمنه على وركي قلو ص
تغنى بالعراق أبو المثنى	وعلم أهله أكل الخبيص

2. Tabarī, VII, 26; Azdī, II, 23.

to allow him to challenge others.<sup>1</sup> In fact, most of the people in the region were now anxious for a period of peace in order to allow them to recover economically from the long and continuous state of war in which they had been embroiled. Kūfa no longer had either the will or the strength to rebel, and its people now turned to political means in their opposition to the Umayyad, in the meanwhile restoring the agriculture of the region.<sup>2</sup> By this time the early signs of the movement which was to lead to 'Abbāsīd revolution were being noticed in 'Irāq, and it was probably felt that the region would soon be able to challenge the Umayyads as part of an empire-wide alliance rather than by itself.<sup>3</sup>

Disagreements with Hishām over the financial operations in the province finally brought about Khālīd's dismissal from office,<sup>4</sup> and he was replaced by a Qaisite fanatic, Yūsuf b. 'Omar (120/737 - 126/743), who was to preside over the last insurrection to take place in 'Irāq under the Umayyads. In 122/739, Zaid b. 'Alī, in Kūfa, led what was in effect a coalition of all the tribes in

---

1. Kāmil, V, 164.

2. Ṭabarī, VII, 143; Jahshiyārī, p. 49.

3. Akhbār, f.334.

4. Ṭabarī, VIII, pp. 250, 255.

‘Irāq against their Syrian masters, and its failure - due to the instability of many alliances amongst the tribal Arab, and to the superior military strength of the Umayyads - marked the last attempt by the province to win its independence.<sup>1</sup>

- 
1. The revolution of Zaid b. ‘Alī has already been studied in detail in my The Revolution of Zaid b. ‘Alī (Najaf, 1966), and will not, therefore, be gone into here. It should be noted, however, that his effort gained no support from the factions that were supporting the ‘Abbāsīd cause, even though both were anti-Umayyad in purpose.



## CHAPTER V

### ARAB TRIBES IN KHURĀSĀN

#### The beginning of the conquest

The battle of Nihāwand in the year 21/641 put an end to Sāsānid domination in 'Irāq and opened the way for the Muslim armies to sweep eastwards.<sup>1</sup> Khalīfa b. Khayyāt relates that most of the soldiers who took part in this battle were Kūfans.<sup>2</sup> Beginning in the period of the governorship of al-Mughīra b. Shu'ba in Baṣra (15/636-17/638), Persia had been entered through al-Ahwāz on various occasions, the most important of which was the campaign ordered by the Caliph 'Omar in the year 17/638, when Abū Mūsa al-Ash'arī was governor.<sup>3</sup> As a result of this invasion, al-Ahwāz, Jundīshāpūr, and Sūs in Khuzistān were overrun, and an advance was made on Tustar.<sup>4</sup> The sources do not specify the tribal composition of this army, Ṭabarī mentioning only Kūfans

1. Khalīfa, V, 143; Ṭabarī, IV, 115. According to Saif b. 'Omar the battle of Nihāwand took place in the year 18/639.
2. Khalīfa, I, pp. 143-4.
3. Khalīfa, I, 127; Ṭabarī, IV, 72.
4. Khalīfa, I, 132; Futūḥ, p. 370; Ṭabarī, IV, pp. 83, 115.

and Baṣrans,<sup>1</sup> while Ibn Khayyāt mentions contingents sent by 'Omar from Medīna.<sup>2</sup>

There was no attempt made at this time to occupy these districts; the Arabs had to keep their armies intact for further penetrations into Sāsānid territory. The usual practice, therefore, was to conclude a peace treaty with the natives and leave only a token garrison behind to signify their subjection. When resistance was shown, or when a rebellion broke out, it was repressed severely, as in the case of Rāmḥurmuz in 29/649.<sup>3</sup> The sources give no indication of the number of troops which took part in such expeditions. Saif b. 'Omar records that thirty thousand men took part in the battle at Nihāwand,<sup>4</sup> but, like the other chroniclers, he does not identify the tribes to which they belonged. In 21/641, the Caliph 'Omar is said to have issued instructions that the tribes of Baṣra should be responsible for the conquest of Fārs, Kirmān and Iṣbahān, while the Kūfans were assigned to Adharbaijān, Rayy and Iṣbahān(!),<sup>5</sup> and this would appear to be the

---

1. Ṭabarī, IV, 84.

2. Khalīfa, I, 139.

3. Futūḥ, p.372.

4. Ṭabarī, IV, 136.

5. Ṭabarī, IV, 137. According to Saif b. 'Omar this order was given in the year 18/639. Iṣbahān was, in fact, conquered by the Kūfans and the Baṣrans came later as reinforcements. Ṭabarī, IV, 161.

first attempt to designate conquered territories to specific tribal groupings.

‘Uthmān b. Abī al-‘Āṣ al-Thaqafī, the governor of Bahrain, occupied the island of Abarkāwān off the coast of Fārs, from where he proceeded against and captured Tawwaj. His forces contained men from ‘Abd al-Qais, Azd, Tamīm and Banū Nāǧīya, and some of these he settled in this region.<sup>1</sup> Tawwaj was used as a base for his further operations, and it was from here that he set out against Shāpūr and Shīrāz in 23/643, after which subjection, he ultimately took Iṣṭakhr.<sup>2</sup> It would also seem that he got control of Dārābjird, although Saif b. ‘Omar credits Sāriya b. Zunaim al-Du‘alī with reducing this city in 23/643, adding that Fārs, too, was among his conquests.<sup>3</sup> In any case, all of Fārs come under Arab domination during the Caliphate of ‘Omar.

After the battle of Nihāwand in 20/640, the province of Jibāl fell to the Arabs.<sup>4</sup> In 22/642, Hamadhān was occupied by a force under the leadership of Nu‘aim b. Muqarran, according to Saif b. ‘Omar;<sup>5</sup>

---

1. Futūḥ, pp. 378-379.

2. Futūḥ, p. 380; Ṭabarī, IV, 177.

3. Ṭabarī, IV, 178.

4. Ma‘ārif, p. 192.

5. Ṭabarī, IV, 147.

however, Balādhurī put the event in 23/643, and mentions Jarīr b. ‘Abdallāh al-Bajalī as the leader who was sent on this mission by the governor of Kūfa, al-Mughīra b. Shu‘ba.<sup>1</sup> Ya‘qūbī puts it in the same year as Saif, but ascribes the leadership to ‘Abdallāh b. Budail al-Khuzā‘ī.<sup>2</sup> The southern parts of the Jibāl district fell to the Arabs with the taking of Dīnawar, Māsbadhān, Mihrajanqadhaq and Šaimara by Abū Mūsā al-Ash‘arī.<sup>3</sup> In the Mu‘jam, Yāqūt speaks of Nihāwand as being a conquest of the Kūfans, and Dīnawar one of the Baṣran victories.<sup>4</sup> Iṣfahānī speaks of the tribe of Madhḥij as being settled in parts of this area, having come here with ‘Amr b. Ma‘d Yakrib; they located themselves in Rūdha, a rustāq in Rayy.<sup>5</sup>

Qum was taken by Abū Mūsā al-Ash‘arī from his base in al-Ahwāz some time after the victory of Nihāwand, and on his orders Aḥnaf b. Qais subjugated Qāshān;<sup>6</sup> both of these places were in the east of the Jibāl district.<sup>7</sup>

---

1. Futūh, p. 306.

2. Ya‘qūbī, II, 134.

3. Futūh, p. 304.

4. Mu‘jam, IV, 827.

5. Aghānī, XV, 224.

6. Futūh, p. 308.

7. Lestranger, pp. 243-244.

About this time Tamīm appears to have entered these regions and made settlements there, ultimately coming to regard them as their own special territories.

On the conquest of Iṣbahān, the last of the great cities of Jibāl, the historians are in disagreement. Some state that the Kūfans, led by ‘Abdallāh b. Budail al-Khuzā‘ī, took it,<sup>1</sup> while others give the credit to the Baṣrans, under the leadership of Abū Mūsā al-Ash‘arī.<sup>2</sup> There is an attempt at harmonizing these two accounts by having ‘Abdallāh b. Budail sent against Iṣbahān by the Caliph ‘Omar in 23/643, but being joined by Abū Mūsā and Aḥnaf b. Qais while still on his way there.<sup>3</sup> Rayy and Dailam were Kūfans conquests, but there is dispute about the leadership of the victorious army; Saif b. ‘Omar names the general as Zaid al-Khail; al-Wāqidī as Qarāza b. Ka‘b.<sup>4</sup> One account mentions Kathīr b. Shihāb al-Hārithī as the conqueror of Dailam.<sup>5</sup> All these places in Jibāl and the rest of Persia at this time were secured by the type of peace-treaty already

---

1. Ṭabarī, IV, 139.

2. Futūḥ, pp. 313, 318. See, Ma‘ārif, p. 167.

3. Futūḥ, p. 310.

4. Futūḥ, p. 313; Ṭabarī, IV, 148.

5. Futūḥ, p. 314.



mentioned, and in many of these districts, rebellions broke out requiring repression.<sup>1</sup>

There is no clarity in the various accounts of the conquest of Adharbaijān. Ṭabarī relates that it was taken by Bukair b. 'Abdallāh after the fall of Rayy, and that in his wake came Simāk b. Kharasha al-Anṣārī and 'Utba b. Farqad as reinforcements. The two latter were said to have brought back to Kūfa immense wealth in booty.<sup>2</sup> According to Balādhurī Adharbaijān was conquered after Nihāwand by Ḥudhaifa b. al-Yammān, approaching here by way of Ardabīl.<sup>3</sup> Madā'inī relates that, after Nihāwand, the Kūfans, led by Ḥudhaifa raided here, and that this took place in 22/642.<sup>4</sup> After the region had been garrisoned, the natives began to show resistance, and this obliged al-Walīd b. 'Uqba, the governor of Kūfa (26/646-30/650) to send reinforcements to its military governor, al-Ash'ath b. Qais. More important, the men he sent were instructed to settle here and to encourage the natives to accept Islām. As to what tribes these settlers belonged the sources

---

1. Futūh, pp. 304, 306.

2. Khalīfa, I, 149; Ṭabarī, IV, pp. 153-154.

3. Futūh, p. 321.

4. Futūh, pp. 322-323; Ṭabarī, IV, 155; Kāmil, III, 34.

give no information, other than that they came from Kūfa. It was, apparently, a congenial region for settlement, for we hear of others migrating here, not only from Kūfa and Baṣra, but also from Syria. Some of these bought land from the owners; and to others the owners actually surrendered their lands and became tenant farmers, on the condition that the Arabs would protect it for them.<sup>1</sup>

Jurjān was said to be in the hands of the Arabs as early as 22/642, with certain men of Kūfa under the leadership of Suwaid b. Muqarran as the occupying force; but another account - by Madā'inī - places its conquest in the year 30/650 without referring to the commander.<sup>2</sup> Al-Balādhurī credits the capture of Ṭabaristān to Sa'id b. al-ʿĀṣ, saying that he held a force of Kūfans here in 29/649;<sup>3</sup> against this comes the statement from an unknown source found in Ṭabarī, placing the event in 22/642.<sup>4</sup>

The contradiction in these various accounts, probably arises from the fact that after the first Arab

---

1. Futūḥ, pp. 324-325; Faqīh, p. 284.

2. Ṭabarī, IV, 152.

3. Futūḥ, p. 330.

4. Ṭabarī, IV, 153.

penetration, revolts took place among the natives which required that further expeditions be sent in order to reclaim the territories. It is difficult to accept Ibn al-Athīr's statement that there was no invasion of Ṭabaristān before Sa'īd b. al-'Ās.<sup>1</sup>

Kirmān, according to Saif b. 'Omar, was taken by an army from Kūfa, led by Suhail b. 'Adī and 'Abdallāh b. 'Itbān, from which Madā'inī dissents, saying that it was led by 'Abdallāh b. Budail al-Khuzā'i.<sup>2</sup> In 23/643, Makrān was subjugated by al-Ḥakam b. 'Amr al-Taghlibī, and Sīstān by 'Āsim b. 'Amr;<sup>3</sup> although Baladhurī places these two conquests in 30/650, mentioning that 'Abdallāh b. 'Āmir, the governor of Baṣra, sent al-Rabī' b. Ziyād al-Ḥārithī there from Kirmān, and that the latter eventually siezed Zaranj the capital of Sīstān.<sup>4</sup> Another version of the event holds that towards the end of the reign

---

1. Kāmil, III, 45.

2. Ṭabarī, IV, 180. It is important to note the names of these leaders, for the troops they led were certainly of their own tribes, and this allows certain inferences about their distribution in the conquered lands.

3. Ṭabarī, IV, 182.

4. Futūḥ, p. 385.

of the Caliph 'Utmān b. 'Affān, Umair b. Aḥmar al-Yashkurī was appointed governor of this region and came here at the head of his tribe. 'Alī, too, seems to have appointed a governor, but he was murdered by certain sections of Tamīm, referred to as Ḥabīṭāt and Yarbū', who were partisans of the 'Uthmān faction. In 36/656, 'Alī sent an army here under the command of Rib'ī b. al-Kās and al-Ḥuṣain b. Abī al-Ḥur, both of whom were from the Banū al-'Anbar of Tamīm, and they put down this insurrection.<sup>1</sup>

The most important of all the provinces in the East was Khurāsān, which was to become the chief region for tribal occupation and the base from which they would launch their attacks further eastward. It was first invaded in 18/639 by troops under the leadership of Aḥnaf b. Qais, entering the region from Ṭabasain. After taking Herāt, one of its chief cities, and placing there a garrison under the command of Ṣuḥār al-'Abdī, he advanced on Marw al-Shāhjān.<sup>2</sup> When this, too, fell to him, he took up residence there, and sent al-Ḥarith b. Ḥassan to secure the western territories

---

1. Futūḥ, p. 387; Kāmil, III, pp. 113-114.

2. Khalīfa, I, pp. 172-173.

around Sarakhs.<sup>1</sup>

Reinforcements were sent to Ahnaf from Kūfa, and these he organized into four groups under individual leaders: 'Alqama b. al-Nadr al-Nadrī, Rib'ī b. 'Āmir al-Tamīmī, 'Abdallāh b. Abī 'Āqil and Ibn Umm Ghazāla al-Hamdānī.<sup>2</sup> These leaders provide a clue to the tribes that came into this area from Kūfa, and it was due to such men and their followers that Marw al-Rūdh and Balkh received a Kūfan orientation.<sup>3</sup> Eventually the whole of Khurāsān, from Tūkhāristān in the East to Nīshāpūr in the West, was conquered, and it would seem that this occurred during the Caliphate of 'Uthmān.<sup>4</sup> In as much as these operations were carried out by military forces, it can be inferred that there was still no thought of permanent settlement or of annexation of new territories, and each new conquest was a consequence of the impetus of victory which drove the Arab armies ever onward after Nihāwand.

In al-Ya'qūbī we read that 'Abdallāh b. 'Āmir, the governor of Baṣra, advanced into Khurāsān, and after

---

1. Tabarī, IV, 167.

2. Ibid., IV, 168.

3. Tabarī, IV, 168. see Khalīfa, I, 174.

4. Bad', V, pp. 197-198.



putting down all local resistance, divided the region into quarters (arbā') over each of which he designated a leader. These four were: Qais b. al-Haitham al-Sulamī, Rāshid b. 'Amr al-Judaīdī, 'Imrān b. al-Fuḍail al-Burjumī and 'Amr b. Mālik al-Khuzā'ī.<sup>1</sup> If one were to accept this as true, it would mean that settlement of a sort did occur as early as the time of 'Uthmān's Caliphate; but al-Balādhurī states quite clearly that the first Arab settlement in Khurāsān (specifically, Marw) was made in the time of Umair b. Aḥmar who was appointed to command of the region by Ziyād b. Abīhi the governor of Baṣra between 45/665 and 50/670.<sup>2</sup> If the latter is to be accepted, the earliest settlement would have been made by Baṣrans; but the arbā'-style of administrative division was peculiarly Kūfan; it is probably safest to assume that elements from both cities participated in the settlement. Ya'qūbī identifies the four administrative regions as Nīshāpūr, Herāt, Marw and Marw al-Rūdh.<sup>3</sup>

---

1. Ya'qūbī, II, 117.

2. Futūḥ, p. 400.

3. According to 'Omar b. Shabba, Ṭabarī, V, 224, Ziyād b. Abīhi divided Khurāsān into four regions, each under a governor: Marw, Abrashahr (i.e. Nīshāpūr), Marw al-Rūdh (including Fāryāb and Ṭāliqān) and Herāt (including Bādghīs, Qādis and Bushanj).

Adharbayjān and Rayy were, from the beginning, Kūfan conquests and they were looked upon as maghāzī, "seats of war", from which booty could be obtained. Abū Mikhnaf speaks of the regions in this vein, and says that in the first district there were six thousand men and in the second, four thousand. In Kūfa a total army of forty thousand went on periodic plundering raids in these two frontier regions (thaghrain); and in this way, he suggests, each man was able to take part in the expeditions once every four years.<sup>1</sup>

In any case, the western section of what is today Persia would at first have been chiefly under the control of Yemenī tribes, since they formed the majority in Kūfa. But during the period of the governorship of al-Walīd b. 'Uqba (25/645-30/650) in Kūfa, Qais began to dominate the area. Salmān b. Rabī'a al-Bāhilī is at this time said to have conquered the lands lying between Adharbayjān and Bāb al-Abwāb (Darband) and to have advanced to Balanjar where he met his death.<sup>2</sup>

After the murder of 'Uthmān, and during the struggle between 'Alī and Mu'āwiya, the situation in the

---

1. Tabarī, IV, 246.

2. Ma'ārif, p.149; Tabarī, IV, 247; Bakrī, I, 276. Salmān, one of the Companions of the Prophet, was appointed qādī of Kūfa by 'Omar. Ishtiqāq, p. 273.

East becomes obscure. The troops in these regions seem to have withdrawn into strategic places, where they were reinforced from time to time. Thus, we are told, 'Alī sent four thousand warriors to Dailam to lend support to the garrison there, even though he needed them for his own needs in 'Irāq.<sup>1</sup>

#### Qaisite Domination of Khurāsān

Mu'āwiya, once established in power, showed a close interest in the East, and he added this concern to the responsibilities of the governor of Baṣra, at that time 'Abdallāh b. 'Āmir. He, in turn, appointed one of his kinsmen, Qais b. al-Haitham al-Qaisī (41/661-43/663), as governor of Khurāsān.<sup>2</sup> Qais took advantage of this relationship and did not send the taxes he collected to Baṣra,<sup>3</sup> so consequently he was replaced by another Qaisite, 'Abdallāh b. Khāzim al-Sulamī.

Mention has already been made of the division of Khurāsān in 45/665 into four quarters by Ziyād b. Abīhi,

---

1. Futūḥ, p. 381.

2. Tabarī, V, 172.

3. Kāmil, III, 189.

and there seems to be evidence that his predecessor, Ibn 'Āmir, too, made some such partition. In fact, both may have merely continued a previous Sāsānian administrative practice.<sup>1</sup> Early in his governorship, Ziyād appointed as commander of Marw, Umair b. Aḥmar, from the powerful tribe of Bakr, who was to remain in this position until his death in 51/671.<sup>2</sup> He appointed in the same year (i.e. 45) al-Ḥakam b. 'Amr al-Ghifārī, a Companion of the Prophet, governor of Khurāsān.<sup>3</sup> The first signs of the hostility between Muḍar and Rabī'a in Khurāsān appeared in the time of Anas b. Abī Unās, whom al-Ḥakam himself had appointed to be his successor before he died in 51. Ziyād refused to confirm this appointment, and sent there as governor Khulaid b. 'Abdallāh al-Ḥanafī of Rabī'a, thereby angering Muḍar to which Anas belonged.<sup>4</sup>

---

1. Lestrangé, p. 424.

2. Ṭabarī, V, 225.

3. Futūḥ, p. 400.

4. Ṭabarī, V, pp. 285-286.

Arab Migration into Khurāsān

This Khulaid was replaced after a few days by al-Rabī' b. Ziyād al-Ḥārithī, who was to play an important rôle in the settlement of the Arabs in Khurāsān. Al-Madā'inī relates that when Ziyād appointed him to governorship in 51/671, many other people whom he wanted to be rid of were sent there with him along with their families.<sup>1</sup> According to al-Balādhurī, these latter numbered fifty thousand;<sup>2</sup> and another report attributed to al-Madā'inī has this number divided exactly between Kūfans and Baṣrans, twenty-five thousand being sent from each city, with al-Rabī' b. Ziyād leading the Baṣrans and 'Abdallāh b. Abī 'Aqīl leading the Kūfans.<sup>3</sup> If we accept this statement, Arabs from both cities would have been equally represented in Khurāsān. A modern attempt to establish the composition of the Arab settlers in Khurāsān, however, reaches the conclusion that Kūfans were only one-sixth of the number; this deduction being made from analogy with the akhmās administration system which the author thinks was introduced here from Baṣra, and which would leave Kūfans as one-sixth of the

---

1. Ṭabarī, V, 286.

2. Futūḥ, p. 400.

3. Ṭabarī, VI, pp. 128, 160, 161.



population.<sup>1</sup> There is, however, no clear evidence that the relationship between Baṣra and Khurāsān was any different from that of Kūfa; certainly, Ziyād treated both the same, when it came to collecting troops for campaigns.

During his governorship of 'Irāq, Arab movement into Khurāsān was continuous. In 56/675 Mu'āwiya is said to have appointed Sa'īd b. 'Uthmān b. 'Affān to administer the province,<sup>2</sup> and that he received from Ziyād b. Abīhi men and materials collected in Baṣra.<sup>3</sup> Also, from Baṣra, were the men who accompanied al-Hakam b. 'Amr al-Ghifārī whom Ziyād himself appointed governor in 45/665.<sup>4</sup> However, neither of these expeditions should be taken as establishing a special relationship between this city and Khurāsān, any more than that of al-Muhallab in 65/684.<sup>5</sup> In fact, at this period the population of both Kūfa and Baṣra were

---

1. Al-'Alī, "Istīṭān al-'Arab fī Khurāsān" Majallat Kulīyyat al-Ādāb, Baghdad, 1958, pp. 75

2. Khalīfa, I, 268; Ṭabarī, V, 305.

3. Ansāb, V, pp. 117-118; Kūfī, I, f.299. There is an obvious confusion here; Ziyād died in 53/672! No doubt it is his son 'Ubaidallāh who is intended. Yet Balādhurī uses the words - 'ammi-ka Ziyād in his narration!

4. Kūfī, I, f.296.

5. Futūḥ, p. 421.

largely the same in tribal composition, and little might be revealed of the nature of the settlement of Khurāsān by dwelling upon the city from which the various migrations or campaigns originated. The rivalry between the two, which might affect the province in this respect, did not exist at this time in the bitterness it was later to assume.

The sons of Ziyād b. Abīhi proved the most loyal of the Umayyad agents in the administration of the provinces: 'Ubaidallāh as governor of Baṣra (including Khurāsān), 'Abbād in Sistān and 'Abd al-Raḥmān as his local representative in Khurāsān.<sup>1</sup> Thus, duplication of responsibilities between 'Ubaidallāh and 'Abd al-Raḥmān should be taken as an indication of how loose the administration of the provinces still was at this time. In 61/680 the Caliph Yazīd b. Mu'āwiya appointed another of Ziyād's sons, Salm to replace 'Abd al-Raḥmān in Khurāsān, and he wrote to 'Ubaidallāh b. Ziyād, who had become governor of 'Irāq after the death of his father in 55/674, to send six thousand warriors with him to the province. In accordance with this order, six thousand (others say two thousand) warriors were chosen from Baṣra [Kūfa is not mentioned], and such notable men as 'Imrān b. al-Fuḍail al-Burjumī, al-Muhallab b.

---

1. Ṭabarī, V, 317.

Abī Ṣufra, 'Abdallāh b. Khāzim and others were appointed to accompany them.<sup>1</sup> This is the last detailed information we have on the movement of Arabs from 'Irāq to Khurāsān until the year 65/684 when large-scale migration resumed again.

### Khurāsān after the Death of Yazīd

By the time Khurāsān came under the government of Salm, it was more or less completely submissive to Arab power and, consequently enjoyed the peace and security which would attract colonists from the perpetual troubles of 'Irāq. However, this increase in migration ultimately meant merely a shift in the locale of these troubles further to the East. For at their base was the insuperable jealousy and suspicion with which the tribal Arab looked on any activity of others of his sort. Yazīd's death served as a signal for this latent incompatibility to flame into open hostility, and produce in Khurāsān the disorder which had become endemic in 'Irāq. In fact, Salm seems to have anticipated that the situation he was trying to control would respond, as it had done, to any external

---

1. Tabarī, V, pp. 471-472; Kāmil, IV, 42.

influence, and he tried unsuccessfully to suppress the news of Yazīd's death. When he found that he could not do so, he appealed to the people for loyalty to himself; and although this was given for a short while, in the end he found he could no longer govern in security and he left Khurāsān for Syria.<sup>1</sup>

His departure, more or less, implied the relaxation of Umayyad control of Khurāsān, and opened the way to ambitious adventurers, prepared to exploit the 'aṣabiyya of the tribes. Before he left, Salm wanted to leave control in the hands of al-Muhallab b. Abī Ṣufra, a celebrated member of Azd, but Sulaimān b. Marthad of Rabī'a persuaded him that he himself should receive this appointment. Thus, Sulaimān was given control of Marw al-Rūdh, Fāryāb, Ṭaliqān and Juzjān, while Aws b. Tha'laba was named governor of Herāt.<sup>2</sup> Salm, of course, must have known that such appointments had no value, and that the control of these regions was going to be taken by whoever could muster the power to seize it. When Salm arrived at Nīshāpūr on his return to Syria, he met 'Abdallāh b. Khāzim al-Sulamī of Qais who criticized him for dividing Khurāsān between Bakr and Yemen, and excluding Qais. Thereupon, Salm appointed

---

1. Ṭabarī, V, 545.

2. Kāmil, IV, 65.

him governor of Khurāsān, and gave him one hundred thousand dirhams to meet his expenses.<sup>1</sup> Ibn Khāzim was already strong enough in the province not to require any official appointment from a man such as Salm.

Khurāsān was now opened to the intrigues and hostilities that had bedevilled Arab occupation in every region. Here Qais, Bakr and Tamīm were prepared to assert their domination, Azd having withdrawn from the contest when al-Muhallab left Marw.<sup>2</sup> Ibn Khāzim soon put an end to the opposition of Tamīm in Marw, and was left facing the power of Bakr, represented by Sulaimān b. Marthad, the governor of Marw, and his brother ‘Amr b. Marthad, the governor of Ṭāliqān. He was able to drive them from here to Herāt, where apparently Ibn Khāzim did not dare to pursue; it may

---

1. Futūḥ, p. 44; Kāmil, IV, 66. Ibn A‘tham (I, f.423) claims that Ibn Khāzim forced Salm to give him half the money he was carrying, and that he held the government of Khurāsān on behalf of ‘Abdallāh b. al-Zubair, the anti-Caliph in Mecca. Ibn Khayyāt (I, 178) says that Ibn Khāzim had held power in Khurāsān since 33/653, when he repelled the attacks of the Turks from the province, and that ‘Abdallāh b. ‘Āmir, the governor of Baṣra, had made him the local ruler; he retained this position until the murder of ‘Uthmān.

2. Tabarī, V, 546.



be that the situation he would leave in his rear was so insecure that it required his constant presence.<sup>1</sup>

Therefore, the sections of Bakr united in Herāt under the leadership of Aws b. Tha'laba, with the declared object of driving Muḍar from Khurāsān. Later, when Ibn Khāzim advanced on Herāt he was supported by Tamīm who felt themselves threatened by Bakr.<sup>2</sup> According to al-Ḍabbī, negotiations between Ibn Khāzim and Bakr, seeking a peaceful solution of their differences, were on the point of a successful conclusion, when the Banū Ṣuhaib intervened, insisting that Ibn Khāzim should virtually accept a tolerated position for Muḍar in Khurāsān under the domination of Bakr. The words used were: "Either every last Muḍarite will be driven from Khurāsān, or you will be allowed to settle there on the condition that you surrender to us all your property, weapons, gold and silver".<sup>3</sup> In the face of such an impossible ultimatum, the negotiations were broken off; but, in fact, Ibn Khāzim realized that there was very little chance that Qais and Bakr could ever overcome their deep-seated hostility peacefully, <sup>recalling</sup> the words:

---

1. Ṭabarī, V, 547; Kāmil, IV, 66.

2. Ṭabarī, V, 547; Kāmil, IV, 66.

3. Ṭabarī, V, 547.

"Rabī'a have been angry with God ever since He sent the Prophet from Muḍar".<sup>1</sup> It was only at the insistence of Tamīm that he had first begun to negotiate; they were afraid for their own position if either Qais or Bakr attained complete supremacy.

In the battle which ensued, Ibn Khāzim was victorious, and Bakr suffered more than eight thousand casualties, either killed or wounded. All the men of Bakr who were taken prisoner on the battle-field were put to the sword.<sup>2</sup> Aws b. Tha'labā fled to Sistān, and Ibn Khāzim appointed his own son Muḥammad governor of Herāt, with a man from Tamīm, Bukair b. Wishāḥ, to assist him as head of security.<sup>3</sup> He himself returned to Marw, and Khurāsān is regarded as coming completely under the domination of Qais in the year 64/683.<sup>4</sup>

---

1. Ṭabarī, V, 548; Kāmil, IV, 66.

2. Ṭabarī, V, 551. The Poet al-Mughīra b. Ḥabnā' describes the defeat of Bakr as a massacre.

3. Ṭabarī, V, 623.

4. Futūḥ, p. 405.

### The Resistance of Tamīm

The reputation of Ibn Khāzim for bravery was won by the resolution he showed in the face of the numerous threats to his power that he was constantly being confronted with in Khurāsān. In the words of al-Zubairī, "It was no shame for even a brave man to flee before two heroes; Ibn Khāzim and Qaṭarī b. al-Fujā'a [the Khārijite]".<sup>1</sup> However, this did not deter Tamīm from attempting to free themselves from his rule. Not being strong enough at first to attack him in Marw, they assaulted and captured Herāt, killing his son.<sup>2</sup> With this as their base, they now ventured against Marw. The fighting went on for over two years, but eventually Tamīm was overcome and forced to disperse in small groups throughout the territory; there Ibn Khāzim was able to destroy them piecemeal. The leaders of Tamīm shut themselves up in a fortified position called Fortanā near Marw al-Rūdh, but after they were induced to surrender they were all put to death, despite Ibn Khāzim's wish to spare them. His son Mūsā, thirsty for revenge for his brother's death, actually threatened to kill even his

---

1. 'Uyūn, I, 175; Ma'ārif, 144; Mubarrad, II, 423.

2. Tabarī, V, 623; Kāmil, IV, pp. 86-88.

father if he had been one of the murderers.<sup>1</sup> This took place in 66/685, and left Ibn Khāzim in control of a peaceful province for a while.

However, in 72/691, Tamīm again returned to the offensive, lead by Baḥīr b. Warqā' al-Ṣuraimī, who had also participated in the earlier insurrection. While engaged on this new challenge, Ibn Khāzim received a message from the Caliph 'Abd al-Malik asking for his oath of loyalty, in return for which he would confirm him in his position.<sup>2</sup> Ibn Khāzim refused and even forced the messenger to eat the letter. According to Ibn Khayyāt this messenger was a man of Tamīm named Sawra b. Abjar al-Dārimī;<sup>3</sup> but Ṭabarī is probably correct in identifying him as Sinān b. Mukammil al-Ghanawī of Qais, and he adds that Ibn Khāzim said to him: "'Abd al-Malik sent you because he knows I will never kill a Qaisite. However, eat the letter!'.<sup>4</sup> In Balādhurī we find Ibn Khāzim writing to 'Abd al-Malik: "How can I face God if I am disloyal to one of His Prophet's disciples (Ibn al-Zubair)?"<sup>5</sup> while al-

---

1. Ṭabarī, VI, 79; Kāmil, IV, 108.

2. Ya'qūbī, III, 14.

3. Khalīfa, I, 387.

4. Ṭabarī, VI, 176.

5. Futūḥ, p. 405.

Maqdisī attributes to him the statement: "Alive, I live for Ibn al-Zubair; and in death, too, I will charge my soul to follow him".<sup>1</sup>

It is not possible to discover in the sources the origins of this relationship between Ibn Khāzim and Ibn al-Zubair, but probably it represents the alignments taken up after the battle of Marj Rāhiṭ, with Kalb supporting the Marwānids and Qais supporting Ibn al-Zubair. However, in Khurāsān the usual tribal groupings were not always possible, mainly because many of the tribes were very weakly represented here. The ones that were strong, such as Tamīm, attempted to assert themselves even against fellow Muḍarites; while we find weakened sections of Rabī'a rallying to the support of Ibn Khāzim. It should be remembered that all the Arabs were in a minority to the natives of the region, and their only security rested in some form of co-operation, if not unity.

#### The Umayyad Restoration

After 'Irāq had been pacified by the murder of Mus'ab b. al-Zubair, 'Abd al-Malik turned his attention

---

1. Bad', VI, 23.



to Khurāsān. His object here was to stir up trouble for Ibn Khāzim among the tribes, by offering them bribes of money.<sup>1</sup> To Bukair b. Wishāḥ, Ibn Khāzim's deputy in Marw, he promised the governorship of the entire territory if he would kill or expel his master. Bukair accepted this offer, and summoned the tribes to pay homage of 'Abd al-Malik, and the position became so dangerous that Ibn Khāzim thought it best to flee to his son Mūsā in Tirmidh. He was pursued by men of Tamīm led by Bahīr b. Warqā' al-Ṣuraimī, and put to death in a village called Shāhmīghd (?) about eight farsakh from Marw.<sup>2</sup> The person who killed him is named as Wakī' b. 'Omair al-Qurai'ī, Ibn al-Dawraqīya.<sup>3</sup> This marks the end of Qais' ten year domination of Khurāsān under Ibn Khāzim.<sup>4</sup>

However, it was now the turn of Tamīm to take control of the province, under the governorship of Bahīr b. Warqā'. But the fragile unity they had shown in opposition disappeared once they held power, and before

---

1. Khalīfa, I, 386; Futūḥ, p. 405.

2. Ṭabarī, VI, 176. Ibn A'tham incorrectly states that Bahīr b. Warqā' was Ibn Khāzim's cousin, and that he killed Bukair b. Wishāḥ as revenge for Ibn Khāzim's murder. Kūfī, II, f.64.

3. Bayān, II, 259; Futūḥ, p. 406; Ishtiqaq, p. 255.

4. Ma'ārif, p. 144.

long we find them divided against themselves. Al-Buṭūn and Muqā'is sided with Baḥīr, while 'Auf and Abnā' supported Bukair, both alliances being in accordance with tribal affinities. Muqā'is and al-Buṭūn<sup>1</sup> favoured Baḥīr because he was descended from Ṣarīm b. Muqā'is b. 'Amr b. Ka'b b. Sa'd b. Zaid-Manāt b. Tamīm. Bukair, on the other hand, had the support of his clan, Banū 'Auf b. Ka'b b. Sa'd b. Zaid-Manāt, who were known as al-Abnā',<sup>2</sup>

The small tribal groups were forced to participate, willingly or not, in this internecine struggle among Tamīm, and ultimately they asked 'Abd al-Malik to find a solution to the troubles. He responded by appointing Umayya b. 'Abdallāh b. Khālīd b. Asīd (74/693-78/697) governor of Khurāsān. He was a man of Quraish against whom none of the parties in the territory could have any hostility;<sup>3</sup> and, moreover, he is presented as being unwarlike and slow to feel enmity.<sup>4</sup> Bakr, eager to free themselves of Tamīmī domination, welcomed him.<sup>5</sup>

- 
1. Al-Buṭūn were descended through 'Amr b. Ka'b b. Sa'd b. Zaid-Manāt.
  2. Jamharat, p. 219; Kāmil, IV, 153. Ibn al-Athīr's account of these events is by far more detailed than that of Ṭabarī.
  3. Khalīfa, I, 386; Ṭabarī, VI, 200.
  4. 'Iqd, I, pp. 142-143; 'Uyūn, I, pp. 166, 171.
  5. Ṭabarī, VI, 201.

Bukair b. Wishāh wanted to be given the governorship of Tūkhārīstān, and at first Umayya was prepared to grant him this wish. However, warned that he might prove disloyal, he changed his mind and charged him with making preparations for an invasion of Transoxiana. This displeased Bukair and aroused his hostility to the new governor; however, another section of Tamīm, led by Baḥīr b. Warqā', already at odds with the faction under Bukair, took Umayya's side.<sup>1</sup>

Transoxiana was a source of worry to the governor of Khurāsān, for the natives were defaulting on the tribute they were obliged to pay under the terms of the treaty they made with the Arabs; for example, the Khātūn of Bukhārā had taken advantage of the dissension among the tribes to withhold the jizya of that region.<sup>2</sup> Umayya led a force against her in order to re-assert his control; but while still on the march, Bukair left the army and returned to Marw, taking the city into his own power. In this he had the support of the Banū al-'Anbar section of Tamīm.<sup>3</sup>

The resentment felt by Tamīm toward the way the affairs of the province were being conducted at this

---

1. Futūḥ, p. 406; Kāmil, IV, 153.

2. Ṭabarī, VI, 312; Narshakhī, pp. 65-66.

3. Ṭabarī, VI, 313; Kūfī, II, f.64; Kāmil, IV, 185.

time is expressed in a conversation between a member of the tribe and Bukair, in which he complained: "We fought hard and suffered many casualties in order to take Khurāsān. When we asked that a man of Quraish be sent here as governor to settle our affairs, we were given one who treats us as his play things and slaves."<sup>1</sup>

Umayya was obliged to return at once from Bukhārā, and try to overcome this display of disobedience in Marw. The matter was settled by negotiation, and a formal compact drawn up in which the rights and prerogatives of Tamīm were recognized. This document was sent to Syria, where it was ratified by 'Abd al-Malik himself. However, this did not prevent Bukair from revolting again in 77/696; this time, however, his disobedience cost him his life, and with his death the power of Tamīm in Khurāsān was diminished for a while.<sup>2</sup>

---

1. Ṭabarī, VI, 312.

2. Futūḥ, p. 407; Ṭabarī, VI, pp. 115-117.

The Azdite Supremacy in Khurāsān

Azd had been present in Khurāsān from the time of the expedition led here by 'Uthmān b. Abī al-ʿĀṣ, and their migration here continued under al-Muhallab b. Abī Ṣufra, who invaded Multān and Kābul during the reign of Muʿāwīya. It is recorded that during the governorship of al-Ḥārith b. ʿAbdallāh in Baṣra, al-Muhallab came here from Khurāsān and selected twenty thousand warriors whose names were entered in the dīwān, eight thousand of them from Azd. With this force he entered al-Ahwāz to combat Khārijite activity in the area.<sup>1</sup>

In Khurāsān, Azd tried at first to maintain a neutral position in the tribal conflicts, but under the threat of Tamīmī domination, they cast in their lot with Ibn Khāzim. Previously, in Baṣra, they were found in alliance with Rabīʿa against Tamīm; and now, here too, they allied themselves with Qais for the same reason. The unusual aspect of this is that, in Baṣra, Qais and Tamīm (both of whom were from Muḍar) were allies; but here the overwhelming attitude of the latter alienated its former friends. After the murder of Ibn Khāzim, this fear of Tamīm became general among the tribes.<sup>2</sup>

In 78/697,<sup>3</sup> Umayya was replaced by al-Muhallab as

---

1. Futūḥ, p. 421; Muʿjam, I, 747.

2. Dīnawarī, p. 267.

3. According to Ibn Khayyāt, the appointment was made in 79/698.



governor of Khurāsān. At this time a man of Azd is reported as saying to al-Muhallab: "You have been in Khurāsān many times already, and have held power here. Thus, you know that Tamīm is the most powerful tribe in the territory, with twenty-four thousand fighting men. They control the treasury, and enjoy the support of the administration. If they ever become fully united, that will be the end of all of us. We should divide and weaken them".<sup>1</sup> This specification of the strength of Tamīm allows us to infer the approximate strength of the Arabs in the area at this date. Madā'inī says that in 96/714, Tamīm numbered only ten thousand,<sup>2</sup> which, if both these figures are accepted as correct, would give an indication of the cost in human life of the various campaigns and the internecine strife among the Arabs. This wastage in manpower was compensated for by large injections of troops into the area, some of them newly appointed governors bringing with them contingents from their own tribes. After the rebellion of Bukair b. Wishāḥ, 'Abd al-Malik sent an army here to support Umayya b. 'Abdallāh, his governor.<sup>3</sup> This influx of Arabs in Khurāsān continued throughout

---

1. Naqā'id, I, 368.

2. Ṭabarī, VI, 512; Kāmil, V, 6.

3. Ṭabarī, VI, 316.

the Umayyad period, but unfortunately the sources do not, as a rule, give clear indication of the tribal background of those migrants.

Under al-Muhallab and his son Yazīd, Azd and Rabī'a re-established the alliance in Khurāsān they had maintained in Baṣra, an expression of their mutual hostility towards the domination of Muḍar.<sup>1</sup> Rabī'a never forgot how they had suffered at the hands of the Qaisite Ibn Khāzim; and, despite their Yemenite propensities, the Muḥallabites always behaved with generosity towards them and treated their enemies of Muḍar with extreme suspicion.<sup>2</sup>

#### The Revival of Qais in Khurāsān

After al-Ḥajjāj had secured his position in 'Irāq, he decided to replace the Muḥallabites in Khurāsān with Qais, his own tribe. To achieve this he had to find some reason that would be acceptable to 'Abd al-Malik, for naturally the Caliph would not want to lose the services of such valuable men. Consequently, he accused them of having given support to Ibn al-Zubair; but to

---

1. Aghānī, XIV, 290.

2. Ṭabarī, VI, 326.

this charge, 'Abd al-Malik replied: "I see nothing wrong in the allegiance of the Muhallabites to Ibn al-Zubair; the fact that they were so faithful to them convinces me that they will serve me with equal loyalty".<sup>1</sup>

However, al-Ḥajjāj persisted in his accusations, playing on the fears of the Caliph, and finally he succeeded in having his own way and Yazīd b. al-Muhallab was dismissed as governor of Khurāsān.<sup>2</sup> There was some trace of envy in al-Ḥajjāj's attitude, for the Muhallabites enjoyed a wide popularity in both 'Irāq and Khurāsān, in contrast to the general hatred shown towards himself.<sup>3</sup>

Qutaiba b. Muslim al-Bāhibī was sent here by al-Ḥajjāj as successor to Yazīd in the year 85/704, and he was to remain as governor until 96/714.<sup>4</sup> The clan of Bāhila was relatively weak and insignificant, which meant that Qutaiba had no people of his own to look to for support, and this probably, was very satisfying to al-Ḥajjāj, for it would compel his governor to look only to himself for support. In Khurāsān Qutaiba formed a special relationship with the al-'Āliya of Qais, and thanks to this they prospered and were able to win control

1. Ṭabarī, VI, 395; Kāmil, IV, 207.

2. Khalīfa, I, 386; Ṭabarī, VI, 395.

3. Farazdaq, II, 42.

بكت جزعا مروا خراسان إذ رأته

بها باهليا بعد آل المهلب

4. According to Ibn Khayyāt the appointment was made in the year 86; I, 381.

of Samarqand which hitherto had been in the hands of the Yemenites.<sup>1</sup> However, when a serious challenge was made to the authority of Qutaiba, this decade-long alliance faded away and he received scant help from Qais.

When Sulaimān b. 'Abd al-Malik assumed the Caliphate in 96/714, he was naturally hostile to the faction of al-Ḥajjāj who had attempted to block his succession.<sup>2</sup> In the sources we are given to understand that Qutaiba revolted in anticipation of the kind of treatment he should expect from Sulaimān, but as usual the reasons advanced are tenuous and in this case even the place where the revolt is supposed to have taken place is not clearly specified.<sup>3</sup> However, in connection with this event, al-Madā'inī supplies valuable information about the distribution of the tribes in the East. According to him the total Arab fighting force numbered 46,000<sup>4</sup> divided as follows: from Baṣra, the al-'Āliya (9,000), Bakr (7,000), both under al-Ḥudain b. al-Mundhir;

1. Kāmil, V, 237.

2. Naqā'id, I, 353; Kāmil, V, 4.

3. Ṭabarī (VI, 520) merely mentions Khurāsān, but goes on to quote a verse from Farazdaq which shows that it occurred in Farghāna:

وَمِنَّا الَّذِي سَلَّ السَّيْفَ وَشَامَهَا عَشِيَّةً بَانَ الْقَصْرَ مِنْ فَرِغَانِ

4. Al-Balādhurī (Futūḥ, pp. 412-413) gives the figure 40,000.

Tamīm (10,000) under ʿDirār b. Ḥuṣain al-Ḍabbī; ʿAbd al-Qais (4,000) under ʿAbdallāh b. ʿUlwān; Azd (10,000) under ʿAbdallāh b. Ḥawdhān. From Kūfa, only 7,000 men under the leadership of Jahm b. Zahr are mentioned, and a further 7,000 mawālī under Ḥayyān al-Nabaṭī are added at the end without indication as to which city they belonged.<sup>1</sup>

Yaʿqūbī reports the event in such a way that it would seem that Qutaiba was actually intending a secession of Khurāsān from the Empire, and he thought that in this he would have general support, both Yemenite and Nizārite.<sup>2</sup> He presented his case as anti-Syrian, and resolved not to pay the land-revenues (fayʿ) to the delegate from the Caliph, nor to receive Syrian troops into the province.<sup>3</sup> In letters to Sulaimān, Qutaiba, while congratulating him on his accession, warned that if he should attempt to replace him as governor of Khurāsān he would not hesitate to withdraw his loyalty.<sup>4</sup> Sulaimān replied ambiguously, urging Qutaiba not to spoil his good record by acts of insubordination; if it should be necessary to relieve him of

---

1. Ṭabarī, VI, 512.

2. Yaʿqūbī, III, 33.

3. Naqāʿid, I, 354.

4. Ṭabarī, VI, 507.



Khurāsān, he could be confident of receiving another governorship. Therefore, he should come to him in Damascus with his brother and his friends in order to discuss the matter.<sup>1</sup> Qutaiba was not deceived by this, and realized that the issue was now either victory or death for himself.

The support given to him by the tribes was not what he had counted on. From the very beginning Azd were opposed to him, but al-Ḥudain b. al-Mundhir, thought it prudent not to manifest this, "reasoning that Tamīm, the largest tribe in Khurāsān, would support Qutaiba out of 'asabiyya if challenged by any Yemenī group, even though they themselves did not like him".<sup>2</sup> Any governor given authority over such fiercely independent and jealous people such as the tribal Arabs could not avoid creating hostility towards himself, and in the event it was the Muḍarite Tamīm who proved most active against him. Their leader in this was Wakī' b. Abī Sūd, who had nourished a hatred for Qutaiba ever since he replaced him by Dirār b. Ḥuṣain al-Ḍabbī as a head of Tamīm.<sup>3</sup>

---

1. Kūfī, II, f.190.

2. Ṭabarī, VI, 511.

3. Ṭabarī, VI, 512; 'Uyūn, I, 111, gives the reason why Qutaiba dismissed Wakī' from the leadership of Tamīm, presumably because he was too self-important and given to rash behaviour.

Another grievance held by Tamīm against Qutaiba was the way he had treated the Banū al-Ahtam. This took place at the time of Qutaiba's advance against Bukhāra, when 'Abdallāh b. 'Abdallāh b. al-Ahtam was left as his deputy in Marw. The latter tried to stir up trouble by reporting to al-Ḥajjāj the large amounts of booty and money Qutaiba had come into possession of. Al-Ḥajjāj sent this letter to Qutaiba, but before he could do anything about it, 'Abdallāh fled to Syria. However, his sons and cousins were captured and slain.<sup>1</sup> Although this incident might have influenced the attitude of Tamīm, it is difficult to understand how it could have affected Azd and Bakr.<sup>2</sup> The sources get around this by having Qutaiba speak insultingly to the leaders of these two tribes, and others, at the time of the revolution.<sup>3</sup> Actually, he seems always to have had some feeling of tribal hostility against them. It is, however, almost impossible to reach any reasonable explanations of the alliances in Khurāsān at this time on the basis of the information which has come down to us - even a section of his own clan of Qais, the Banū 'Āmir, sided with his enemies, because, we are told, he

---

1. Naqā'id, I, pp. 374-377; Futūḥ, pp. 414-415.

2. Naqā'id, I, pp. 358-359.

3. Ya'qūbī, III, 33; Ṭabarī, VI, pp. 509-510.

neglected them during his period of power.<sup>1</sup>

### Azd returns to Power

After the murder of Qutaiba and the assumption of power by Wakī', the attitude of the tribes showed a curious reversal, and now they are fired with a burning desire for vengeance on those responsible for the deed. When we read of the revolt of Qutaiba, we should probably interpret it rather as the revolt of the local tribes against him, or, better, the revolt of Tamīm against Qais; and indeed the Caliph Sulaimān sent orders to his new governor Yazīd b. al-Muhallab that if Qais could prove that Qutaiba did not rebel he should punish the men who killed him.<sup>2</sup> As a result, Wakī' and his friends were imprisoned and deprived of their possessions.<sup>3</sup>

With the advent of the Muhallabites the power of Tamīm in Khurāsān was once again curtailed, and we find Yazīd seeking to propitiate the Azd of Marw, reminding them of the favourable treatment they had received in the past from his father.<sup>4</sup> Profiting from the experiences

---

1. Nahj, I, pp. 309-310.

2. Kāmil, V, 10.

3. Futūḥ, p. 414; Kāmil, V, 10.

4. Naqā'id, I, pp. 367-368.

of Qutaiba, who was powerless once abandoned by Qais, he wanted to assure the undeviating support of his own tribal elements. He did, in fact, put them into a dominant position in the region; and even after 'Omar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz replaced him as governor by al-Jarrāh b. 'Abdallāh al-Ḥakamī, another Yemenite from the Sa'd al-'Ashīra clan of Madhḥij,<sup>1</sup> the Yemenī tribes, including Azd, enjoyed a period of prosperity.

It was the excessive favouritism shown by al-Jarrāh to the Yemenites that led to his dismissal after about a year and a half;<sup>2</sup> but his replacement was another Yemenite, 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Nu'aim of Azd.<sup>3</sup> This Yemenite superiority in the province was to persist down to the year 102/702, when Maslama b. 'Abd al-Malik became governor of 'Irāq. He appointed Sa'īd b. 'Abd al-'Azīz b. Abī al-'Āṣ, known as Sa'īd Khudhaina, as governor of Khurāsān, and under his rule Tamīm regained some of their former importance. In particular, he enjoyed the support of Sawra b. al-Ḥur of Dārim, through whose influence with the governor Shu'ba b. Ḍuhair al-Nahshalī was appointed governor of Samarqand in 102/720.<sup>4</sup>

---

1. Ishtiqāq, p. 406.

2. Futūḥ, p. 415.

3. Ṭabarī, VI, 561; Jamharat, p. 378.

4. Ṭabarī, VI, pp. 605-606.

As a result of the rebellion of the Muhallabites in 'Irāq, the policy of the Caliphate became markedly hostile towards Azd and this was manifested in Khurāsān also. Any pretext was sufficient to allow this hostility to be put into action - some members of Azd even being accused of stealing money.<sup>1</sup> But, of course, the most effective way of pursuing such a policy was to favour Tamīm, the traditional enemies of Azd. In 102/720,<sup>2</sup> Maslama b. 'Abd al-Malik replaced Sa'īd Khudhaina as governor of Khurāsān by Sa'īd b. 'Amr al-Harashī from the 'Āmir b. Ṣa'ṣa'a clan of Qais;<sup>3</sup> and he was followed by another Qaisite, Muslim b. Sa'īd, in 104/722. At this same time Kirmān was under the rule of Jabala b. 'Abd al-Rahmān of the Bāhila section of Qais.<sup>4</sup>

---

1. Ṭabarī, VI, 606.

2. According to Ṭabarī (VI, 619), 'Omar b. Hubaira who succeeded Maslama, as a governor of 'Irāq, in 103/720, made this appointment.

3. Futūh, p. 416; Jamharat, p. 288.

4. Ṭabarī, VII, 18.



The Arab Tribes in Transoxiana

The Arabs first came into Transoxiana in 54/673 when 'Ubaidallāh b. Ziyād was governor of Khurāsān.<sup>1</sup> There was some hesitancy about crossing the Oxus, the traditional border between Īrān and Turan, and penetrating into a region of the unknown. However, in this period, Transoxiana (Māwarā' al-Nahr<sup>2</sup>) was an area of quite definite attraction,<sup>3</sup> divided into five regions: Ṣughd, centred about the great cities of Samarqand and Bukhārā, the last described by Iṣṭakhrī (p. 472) as "the fairest city of all Islām". West of Ṣughd was Khwarizm, and to its south-east Ṣaghāniyān and Khuttal. To the east was the region centred about Farghāna, which Ya'qūbī calls "a noble and majestic city".<sup>4</sup> To the north and west was Shāsh (Tāshqand), in which the Turkish peoples of Central Asia were most numerous, and which was to become the chief source of resistance to Arab penetration.

According to Balādhurī, 'Ubaidallāh b. Ziyād was accompanied on his campaign by 24,000 men and he

1. Ṭabarī, V, pp. 296-297.

2. It was, also, known as Bilād al-Hayāṭila. Cf. Maqdisī, p. 361.

3. Iṣṭakhrī, II, 463. "It is one of the most fruitful parts of the world and the best to live in".

4. Buldān, p. 75; Cf., also, Iṣṭakhrī, p. 513 ("No part of Transoxiana contains more settled places"), and Maqdisī, p. 362.

proceeded as far as Ṣaghāniyān to the east of Bukhārā. The queen (khātūn) of Bukhārā sued for peace, and the army returned to Khurāsān with a large number of slaves.<sup>1</sup> We do not know the tribal composition of this army, nor indeed the purpose of the campaign itself, but it is certain that it was not intended to secure more lands for settlement, and that it represented the initiative of the local Arabs rather than caliphatal policy.

The first crossing of the Oxus which was based on government policy was made during the governorship of 'Ubaidallāh's successor, Sa'īd b. 'Uthmān b. 'Affān, as a result of which the region as far as Samarqand was brought into a closer relation with Khurāsān, the treaty concluded with the Khātūn being renewed.<sup>2</sup> However, it was under the Muhallabite governorship that the first attempts at a real incorporation of Māwarā' al-Nahr were made; al-Muhallab b. Abī Ṣufra himself remained there for two years. This was not to prove successful; his manpower was too small to be effective in such a large area and in a terrain not suitable to Arab methods of warfare.<sup>3</sup> His attitude was expressed when, on being urged to advance against Ṣughd, he replied, "My one hope from this expedition is that the army may return

---

1. Futūḥ, p. 401.

2. Futūḥ, p. 401; Ya'qūbī, II, 172.

3. Ṭabarī, VI, pp. 323, 326; Kāmil, IV, 187.

safely to Marw".<sup>1</sup> It would seem at this time the Arabs regarded Transoxiana primarily as a region for summer raiding from their base in Marw. Such raids, moreover, left the region in a state of unsettlement, preventing the various native elements from coming together and presenting a united front, and ultimately preparing them to seek capitulation rather than confrontation.

Arab settlement of Transoxiana came with Qutaiba b. Muslim; in effect it was a garrisoning of the region. He had some local co-operation in this; Balādhurī records. "The dihqān of Balkh and the ruler of Ṣaghāniyān helped the Arabs and invited them to settle in this land, because of their hostility to the ruler of Ākhrūn and Shūmān".<sup>2</sup> He entered here in 87/705, following the route used by previous expeditions: Marw, Marw al-Rūdh, Āmul, Zamm; the Oxus was crossed at Baykand. This latter city surrendered to him after a determined resistance, and he appointed Warqād b. Naṣr al-Bāhilī to administer it. The conquest of Baykand, also, provided the Arabs with a great quantity of weapons, the city obviously having been a fortress for the protection of the ford at this point of the river.<sup>3</sup> What resistance

---

1. Ṭabarī, VI, 327.

2. Futūḥ, p. 409. See Khalīfa, I, 381.

3. Khalīfa, I, 397; Ṭabarī, VI, pp. 430, 432; Narshakhī, p. 70.

Qutaiba met was sporadic and un-coordinated; Dīnawarī reports, "The King of Ṣaghāniyān fled and left all his kingdom to the Arab conquerors".<sup>1</sup>

Qutaiba initiated the policy of recruiting natives into Arab armies, and we are told, for instance, that in 94/712, he forced the people of Bukhārā, Kish, Nasaf, and Khwārizm to provide him with twenty thousand men to serve in his campaign against Ṣughd.<sup>2</sup> Meanwhile, Arabs from other provinces, notably Sind, were moving northward to join his army, and in 96/714, we find Qutaiba actually settling Arab families in Samarqand.<sup>3</sup>

This settlement could not have been on a large scale, for we do not find Transoxiana played any significant rôle in the political affairs of the Caliphate as would have been the case if Arabs were present here in the number they were in the other provinces. The Jayhūn was to remain the boundary between Arab and Turkish hegemony throughout the remainder of the Umayyad period.

---

1. Ṭabarī, VI, 483.

2. Ṭabarī, VI, 500; Kāmil, V, 2.

3. Ṭabarī, VI, 500.

## CHAPTER VI

### THE ARAB TRIBES AND THE COLLAPSE OF THE Umayyads

In the Caliphate of Hishām b. ‘Abd al-Malik (105/723-125/742), the power wielded by the Arab tribes throughout the lands of Islām began to show signs of decline, with the consequent weakening of Umayyad authority which was based on them. The most serious manifestations of Arab intransigence took place in Khurāsān, and already at the beginning of his reign we read of a struggle between Muḍar and Yemen in Brūqān near Balkh, which took place in 106/724, when ‘Amr b. Muslim al-Bāhilī, the brother of Qutaiba, revolted against the governor of Khurāsān, Muslim b. Sa‘id. The latter appointed Naṣr b. Sayyār, the chief of Muḍar, to suppress this revolt, and under his leadership were Tamīm and Asad. ‘Amr enjoyed the support of Azd and Rabī‘a (including Taghlib and Bakr). The rebels were unsuccessful, and had to accept defeat at the hands of Naṣr.<sup>1</sup> The rebellion is said to have arisen from the objections of these tribes to being sent to Transoxiana, where raiding was no longer so profitable as in the past;

---

1. Ṭabarī, VII, 30; Kāmil, V, 51.



and, no doubt, these Yemenī tribes felt that the Muḍarite governor was trying to get rid of them. In Transoxiana, too, the district under the control of Naṣr b. Sayyār, a revolt took place which had to be put down by the sword.<sup>1</sup>

In Balkh, a Yemenī governor, Asad b. 'Abd allāh al-Qasrī, the brother of Khālīd al-Qasrī, the governor of 'Irāq, was so flagrantly partial to the southern Arabs that the Caliph had to dismiss him.<sup>2</sup> It was reported that he had the heads of his Muḍarite lieutenants shaven to disgrace them for their lack of success against the Turks and Ṣughd.<sup>3</sup> He was replaced by Ashras b. 'Abdallāh al-Sulamī of Qais in 109/727. It was the policy of Hishām here, as elsewhere, to favour no particular tribe in his appointments, thereby hoping to present an appearance of impartiality.

Ashras could not avoid alienating the natives of the region, being forced to carry out policies imposed on him by the central Caliphate; and in Transoxiana the Arabs, too, resented the way in which he carried out his duties.<sup>4</sup> He was dismissed from

1. Futūh, p. 417.

2. Ṭabarī, VII, 49; Kāmil, V, 56.

3. Kūfī, II, f.274.

4. Ṭabarī, VII, 55.

office, in 111/729 according to al-Madā'inī or in 112/730 according to al-Balādhurī,<sup>1</sup> and Ibn A'tham specifies that it was his lack of success in the wars against the Turks that led to his removal.<sup>2</sup> He was succeeded by al-Junaid b. 'Abd al-Rahmān al-Murri who maintained a totally Muḍarite bias in his government of the region, members of no other tribes being given a share in the administration. Qaṭan b. Qutaiba was appointed governor of Bukhārā, al-Walīd b. al-Qa'qā' al-'Absī of Herāt; Muslim b. 'Abd al-Rahmān al-Bāhilī of Balkh; and Shaddād b. Khālīd al-Bāhilī was designated ʿāmil al-Kharāj in Samarqand, and through these offices the power of Muḍar was re-established in the important centres of the East.<sup>3</sup>

Migration of Arabs into Khurāsān continued throughout al-Junaid's governorship, and one account

---

1. Futūh, p. 418; Ṭabarī, VII.

2. Kūfī, II, f.274.

3. Ṭabarī, VII, 69. Al-Dīnawarī, p.321, incorrectly states that al-Junaid was from Yemen, probably tracing his descent from the Banū Murra of Yemen. In fact, his lineage derives from the Banū Murra b. 'Awf b. Sa'd b. Dhūbiān of Qais. Jamhart, p. 252. He, also, seems to have thought that it was al-Junaid and not his successor Asad b. 'Abdallāh al-Qasrī who in 117/735 was addressed by Sulaimān b. Kathīr as a fellow Yemenite. Ṭabarī, VII, 108.

mentions that ten thousand men of Kūfa and the same number from Baṣra were sent here by the Caliph at his request.<sup>1</sup> With such reinforcements al-Junaid was able to maintain the security of the region; but when he died in 116/734 and was succeeded by 'Āṣim b. 'Abdallāh b. Yazīd al-Ḥārithī this fragile peace was shattered.<sup>2</sup> Al-Ḥārith b. Suraij of Tamīm, supported by Azd and the native landowners (dahāqīn), led a revolution which soon snatched control of Khurāsān from the hands of its Umayyad governor.<sup>3</sup> 'Āṣim appealed to Damascus, but even the Syrian troops which were sent in response to this plea could not effectively break the power of Tamīm until 128/745. Realizing his inability to cope with the situation, 'Āṣim asked to be relieved of his office in 117/735, and recommended that henceforth the affairs of Khurāsān should be given overall direction from 'Irāq rather than Damascus, so that help when needed could be sent more speedily.<sup>4</sup>

When Asad b. 'Abdallāh al-Qasrī was returned to Khurāsān as governor in 117/735, only Marw and

---

1. Futūḥ, p. 418.

2. Kūfī, II, f.242.

3. Ṭabarī, VII, 330; Kāmil, V, 123.

4. Ṭabarī, VII, 99; Kāmil, V, 73.

Abrashahr (Nīshāpūr) remained under Umayyad control.<sup>1</sup> His pro-Yemenī attitude, which had previously caused his dismissal from this office, again manifested itself, and again caused a violent reaction. Al-Madā'inī mentions that he released the Qaisite officials ('ummāl) who had been imprisoned by 'Āṣim,<sup>2</sup> but this did nothing to alleviate the resentment felt towards him by the Northmen Arabs in the province.

#### The Governorship of Naṣr b. Sayyār

After the death of Asad in 120/737, Hishām appointed Naṣr b. Sayyār governor of Khurāsān, against the advice of men such as Yūsuf b. 'Omar, who wished to see a Qaisite in this position.<sup>3</sup> We really do not know what were the reasons that persuaded the Caliph that Naṣr would be the best person for this post. In one place, Ṭabarī indicates that he had no strong tribal connections in Khurāsān, the Caliph being made to say "I will be his clan!";<sup>4</sup> while in another place he speaks

---

1. Ṭabarī, VII, 105.

2. Ibid., VII, 104.

3. Ṭabarī, VII, 156; see, Ya'qūbī, III, pp. 57-58.

4. Dīnawarī, p. 343; Ṭabarī, VII, 156.

of him as the leader of Muḍar in the province.<sup>1</sup> He is presented as brave, honest and intelligent, and well-versed in politics;<sup>2</sup> but despite this he was still a fanatic in his tribal loyalties.

He divided Khurāsān up among the tribes of Muḍar: Muslim b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Muslim was given control of Balkh; Wishāh b. Bukair b. Wishah of Marw al-Rūdh; al-Hārith b. ‘Abdallāh b. al-Hashraj of Herāt; Ziyād b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Qushairī of Abrashahr (Nīshāpūr); Abū Ḥafṣ b. ‘Alī of Khwarizm; and Qaṭan b. Qutaiba of Ṣughd.<sup>3</sup> On the other hand, he persecuted the tribes of Rabī‘a and Yemen.<sup>4</sup> When a Yemenite complained to him that the province had never before known such persecution, Naṣr's reply was that the Yemenite domination under Asad was fierce in its partisanship.<sup>5</sup>

During the first four years of his governorship Naṣr did not employ anyone from outside Muḍar in the important posts,<sup>6</sup> and he seems to have been motivated

---

1. Ṭabarī, VII, 155.

2. *Ibid.*, VII, 156.

3. *Ibid.*, VII, 157.

4. Kūfī, II, f.467.

5. Ṭabarī, VII, 157.

6. *Ibid.*, VII, 158.



by a desire to exact vengeance on Rabī'a and Yemen. But Naṣr had his enemies among Qais, also, notably Yūsuf b. 'Omar, the governor of 'Irāq. It was he, we are told, who instigated Maḡhrā' b. Aḥmar al-Qaisī to speak against Naṣr in the Caliph's presence. Nor was this the only time that Yūsuf sought to have the governorship taken from him; but on each occasion the Caliph refused to be persuaded. We are not told the reason why Quraish so disliked Naṣr.<sup>1</sup>

Naṣr's greatest difficulties came with the accession of the Yazīd b. al-Walīd in 126/743. The new Caliph appointed Maṣṣūr b. Jumhūr governor of 'Irāq and Khurāsān, and the latter, in turn, made his brother Maṣṣūr his representative in the east. Naṣr simply refused to recognize his authority, and continued to rule the province as previously. When Azd tried to take advantage of this situation by asserting its own claims to preference - for, after all, Yazīd had come to the Caliphate by Yemenī support and his governor in 'Irāq, too, was from Yemen - they were warned that anyone who sought to provoke trouble would lose his head.<sup>2</sup> Undaunted, Judai' b. Alī al-Kirmānī, the chief of Azd, attempted

---

1. Ṭabarī, VII, 226.

2. Ibid., VII, 278.

to restore Khurāsān to Yemenī control, but found that Muḍar was too strong for him to challenge. Consequently, he entered into an alliance with Rabīʿa; and Dīnawarī (p. 336) relates that a messenger was sent to Kūfa to bring back a copy of the treaty which had been concluded between the two in pre-Islamic times so that the same conditions could be again applied.

Naṣr reacted to this challenge by throwing Judaiʿ into prison; and after Azd and Rabīʿa had forcibly released him, the hostilities between themselves and Muḍar were brought out into the open.<sup>1</sup> About this time (127/744), al-Ḥārith b. Suraij of Tamīm, who had been living among the Turks since his unsuccessful rebellion in 116/734, was allowed to return to Khurāsān. Thus, the city of Marw was divided among four groups, each hungry for power: Azd and Rabīʿa under the leadership of Judaiʿ, Muḍar led by Naṣr, Tamīm led by al-Ḥārith and Bakr led by Shaibān b. Salama.<sup>2</sup> The latter, however, was unable to compete with the other three, so it soon abandoned the contest and moved away to Sarakhs.<sup>3</sup>

At first Naṣr tried to set the other two against each other; but when this did not succeed he sought to

1. Dīnawarī, p. 330; Yaʿqūbī, III, 62; Badʿ, VI, 62.

2. Muḥabbar, p. 255.

3. Khalīfa, II, 410; Kāmil, V, 154.

deal with them individually. When he was gaining supremacy over Tamīm, al-Hārith turned to Azd for assistance, and together they forced Naṣr to flee to Abrashahr.<sup>1</sup> As Azd was stronger than Tamīm, the power in Marw fell into the hands of Judai'; and when al-Hārith attempted to alter this situation by leading a revolt of Tamīm, he was defeated and lost his life.<sup>2</sup>

In 129/746, Abū Muslim al-Khurāsānī, taking advantage of these disorders among the Arabs, proclaimed his revolt against the Umayyad in a place called Bushanj, and, with his followers, marched against Marw. This new threat persuaded Naṣr and Judai' to compose their own differences and present a united front; but Naṣr had hardly returned to Marw than he succeeded in having Judai' assassinated, thus taking the control of the city into his hands.<sup>3</sup> By now the Arabs were so weakened by their internal dissensions that it was clear that they would not be able to oppose Abū Muslim; so, when the latter approached the city, they withdrew and in the course of their retreat, Naṣr died.<sup>4</sup> In 130/747, the flag

---

1. Khalīfa, II, 404; Ṭabarī, VII, 339.

2. Khalīfa, II, 404; Ṭabarī, VII, 340.

3. Khalīfa, II, 412.

4. Ibid., II, 419.

of the Umayyads was taken down from the walls of Marw. The advice given to Abū Muslim by the 'Abbāsīd leader, Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad b. 'Alī, reveals the tribal situation in Khurāsān at this time: "As for the Yemenites, respect them and stay with them, for it is through them that God's work will be done; as for the Rabī'ites, you must be wary of them; and as for the ~~Mudar~~ites, they are enemies".<sup>1</sup>

Conclusion: The Arab Tribes in the last days of Umayyad Rule

The political abilities of Hishām b. 'Abd al-Malik<sup>2</sup> and his recognition of the problems facing the Empire, contrived to stay the collapse that had been threatening ever since the death of al-Walīd b. 'Abd al-Malik, but after his own death there was no successor capable of dealing with an ever more rapidly deteriorating situation. Al-Walīd b. Yazīd sought to maintain his own position by temporizing with the Arab tribes, and ended by alienating the Yamenīs in Syria on whom his power really depended.<sup>3</sup> The malaise afflicting the state is

---

1. Ya'qūbī, III, 35; Tabarī, VII, 344; Azdī, II, 62.

2. Muruj, III, 123.

3. Tabarī, VII, 231.

reflected in the sources by incidents trivial in themselves,<sup>1</sup> but even these lead to the conclusion that the very basis upon which Umayyad authority rested had become eroded beyond recovery.

When Yazīd b. al-Walīd b. 'Abd al-Malik led the southern tribes of Qudā'a and Sakūn in a revolt against his cousin, the Caliph al-Walīd, the Qaisite supporters of the latter were unable to save his life or their own brief period of domination.<sup>2</sup> When Yazīd himself became Caliph, the atmosphere of Syria was poisoned by the extreme hostility between the two Arab groups. The poet Ibn Dhu'āla al-Kalbī expresses the arrogance of the Yemenites in these lines:

Who will tell Qais and Khindif, and the leaders  
of 'Abd Shams and Hāshims,

(That) we have killed the Caliph in revenge for  
Khālid, and have sold his children for money.<sup>3</sup>

---

1. Such as the account in Dīnawarī (p. 322) of al-Walīd's treatment of Khālid b. 'Abdallāh al-Qasrī; after which he is reported as writing a poem proclaiming his reliance on the Nizārite. Other versions of the incident are to be found in Ṭabarī, VII, 234 and Azdī, II, 52. Ya'qūbī, III, 62, makes it clear that al-Walīd had lost popular support in Syria.

2. Azdī, II, 57.

3. Azdī, II, 55; Aghānī, VII, 81.



All the chief offices of state and positions of power were now divided among men of Yemenī origin, the court of the Caliph being dominated by Yazīd b. Khāld al-Qasrī, and the governorship of Egypt being given to Ḥafs b. al-Walīd al-Ḥaḍramī.<sup>1</sup> The Caliph Yazīd died within a year of acceding to the throne, and was succeeded by his brother Ibrāhīm, of whom Mas'ūdī says: "His reign was remarkable for confusion and disorder; opinions were in conflict and no one respected the Caliph".<sup>2</sup> Al-Azdī records that Ibrāhīm was sometimes referred to as amīr rather than Khalīfa.<sup>3</sup>

In 127/744, when Marwān b. Muḥammad, at the head of a confederation of Muḍar tribes, including Tamīm, Qais and Kināna, marched on Damascus and put an end to Ibrāhīm's reign,<sup>4</sup> the situation underwent the predictable reversal, with the Yemenī tribes now out of both favour and office, but with the same brooding atmosphere of hatred and resentment unchanged.

In 'Irāq, the polarization of the Arabs was, if anything, worse than in Syria. The Caliph Walīd's anti-Yemenite sentiments prompted him to maintain as governor

---

1. Ya'qūbī, III, 63.

2. Murūj, III, 233.

3. Azdī, II, 61.

4. Dīnawarī, p. 334; Ṭabarī, VII, pp. 299-300; Azdī, II, 61.

of the province Yūsuf b. 'Omar al-Thaqafī, and he sought to satisfy his master by behaving with extreme severity towards the southern Arabs under his jurisdiction. Of course, the accession of Yazīd b. al-Walīd to the Caliphate had the same consequences here as in Syria; with the difference that the man named to succeed Yūsuf b. 'Omar in 126/743, as governor of 'Irāq was Maṣṣur b. Jumhūr,<sup>1</sup> the Kalbite fanatic who was among the six murderers of the Caliph al-Walīd.<sup>2</sup> This could only exacerbate an already dangerous situation, and there is probably truth in the account given in Ṭabarī (VII, 284) that Yazīd thought it best to replace him in 126/743 by 'Abdallāh b. 'Omar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz who enjoyed the respect of most of the inhabitants.<sup>3</sup> Even he could do nothing, however; the Syrians who had established themselves in the province refused to give up the lands that had been granted to them, and the inter-tribal hostility received a new dimension in economic rivalry.

The active feuding started between Kūfans and Syrians; when 'Abdallāh b. Mu'āwiya b. Ja'far sought

---

1. Ṭabarī, VII, pp. 254, 266, 277.

2. Ishtiqāq, p. 541.

3. Ya'qūbī, (III, 66) says that Yūsuf b. 'Omar remained as governor throughout the whole of Yazīd's reign.

to lead a revolt in Kūfa in 127/744, Rabī'a and Yemen were among his supporters. His efforts were unsuccessful, and he had to flee to Jibāl for refuge.<sup>1</sup> But no sooner was this problem dealt with than 'Abdallāh b. 'Omar found himself being challenged for the office of governor by al-Nadr b. Sa'īd al-Ḥarashī, the appointee of the new Caliph Marwān. The latter was supported by the local Nizārītes, while 'Abdallāh had to depend on the Yemenī factions.<sup>2</sup> A third element of menace in his situation was the growing activities of the Kharijites, and Marwān sought to remedy the situation by appointing a new governor whom he thought might win popular acceptance, Yazīd b. 'Omar b. Hubaira.<sup>3</sup> But the affairs of 'Irāq had now reached a point where no palliative solution was possible, and the arrival of the 'Abbāsīd armies from Khurāsān which brought an end to Umayyad power met no resistance from a people who had exhausted their energies in fighting among themselves.

There can be no question about the causes that contributed to the collapse of the Umayyad state, and

---

1. Ṭabarī, VII, 303; Azdī, II, 107; Kāmil, V, 131.

2. Ṭabarī, VII, 321; Azdī, II, 136.

3. Ya'qūbī, III, pp. 66-67; Ṭabarī, VII, 347.

the central rôle played by Arab tribalism. However, it must be recognized that much of this tribal antagonism was, in reality, an expression of regionalism, and that no Caliph resident in Damascus could ever hope to win the acceptance of Kūfa and Baṣra, whatever his tribal support. Outside of Syria itself, where the antipathy of Muḍar to Yemen was elevated to what in modern terms might be called a "two party system", tribal feeling is always moderated by local considerations. In fact, much of the tribal antagonism in 'Irāq and Khurāsān was fomented by the Caliphs themselves in appointing governors who brought with them to these provinces their Syrian attitudes, and whose only experience of the exercise of power was through tribal intrigue. In terms of its Arab population, Khurāsān was but a projection of 'Irāq, and the revolt which originated there can be regarded as the final protest of the 'Irāqīs to Syria domination. It is above all significant that the 'Abbāsīd armies that overthrew the Umayyads were of mixed tribal composition,<sup>1</sup> and that with the establishment of the new state the incessant dwelling upon tribal motivation in explanation of events gradually disappears from the history.

---

1. Dīnawarī, pp. 359, 362, 365.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY



## Sources

- Abū Tammām, Ḥabīb b. Aws (d. 231/845).  
al-Ḥamasa, ed. G.G. Freytag, Bonn, 1828,  
 and Beirut, 1889.
- Abū 'Ubaid, al-Qāsim b. Sallām (d. 224/836).  
al-Amwāl, Cairo, 1353.
- Abū 'Ubaida, Ma'mar b. al-Muthannā (d. 209/825).  
Naqā'id Jarīr wa 'l-Farazdaq, Leiden, 1905.
- Abū Yūsuf, Ya'qūb b. Ibrāhīm (d. 182/798).  
Kitāb al-Kharāj, Cairo, 1352.
- Akhbāb al-'Abbās wa Wildihi, anonymous, MS. Preserved  
 in the Institute of Higher Islamic Studies,  
 Baghdad.
- Al-Azdī Abū Zakariyya Yazīd b. Muḥammad (d. 334/945).  
Ta'rīkh al-Mouṣil, Cairo, 1967.
- Al-Bakrī, 'Ubaidallāh b. 'Abd al-'Azīz b. Muḥammad.  
Mu'jam mā Ista'jam min asmā' al-Bilād  
wa 'l-Mawādi'. Cairo, 1945-51.
- Al-Balādhurī, Aḥmad b. Yahya (d. 279/892).  
Ansāb al-Ashrāf, Vol. XI, Greifswold, 1883.  
Ansāb al-Ashrāf, Vol. V, Jerusalem, 1936;  
 Vol. IV, ii, Jerusalem, 1938.  
Ansāb al-Ashrāf, Vols. II, III and VI,  
 MS. Preserved in the Institute of Higher  
 Islamic Studies, Baghdad.  
Futūḥ al-Buldān, Cairo, 1932.

- Al-Dīnawarī, Abū Ḥanīfa Aḥmad b. Dāwūd, (d. 282/895).  
al-Akhbār al-Ṭiwāl, Leiden, 1888 and Cairo,  
 1960-
- Al-Farazdaw, Tammām b. Ghālib (d. 112/730).  
Dīwān, Beirut, 1960.
- Al-Hamdānī, Abū Muḥammad al-Ḥasan b. Aḥmad (d. 334/945).  
al-Iklīl, Vol. VIII, Baghdad, 1931, Vol. X,  
 Cairo, 1949.  
Ṣifat Jazīrat al-‘Arab, Leiden, 1884.
- Ḥassān b. Thābit (d. 54/673).  
Dīwān, Leiden, 1910.
- Al-Ḥimyarī, Abū Sa‘īd Nashwān b. Sa‘id (d. 573/1178).  
Muntakhabāt fī Akhbār al-Yemen, Leiden, 1916.
- Ḥudūd al-‘Ālam, (anonymous). translated and explained  
 by V. Minorsky, Oxford, 1933.
- Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, Abū ‘Omar Yūsuf b. ‘Abdallāh al-Namarī  
 (d. 463/1070).  
 al-Inbāh ‘Ala Qabā’il al-Ruwah, Cairo, 1350.
- Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq, Ṣafī ‘l-Dīn ‘Abd al-Mu‘min,  
Marāṣid al-Iṭṭilā‘ ‘Alā Asmā’ al-Amākina wa  
‘l-Biqā‘, Cairo, 1954-5.
- Ibn ‘Abd Rabbih, Aḥmad b. Muḥammad (d. 328/940).  
al-‘Iqd al-Farīd, Cairo, 1940 and 1948.
- Ibn Abi ‘l-Ḥadīd, ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd b. Hibat Allāh (d. 655/1258).  
Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāgha, Cairo, 1329.
- Ibn ‘Asākir, Alī b. Ḥasan (d. 571/1176).  
Tahdhīb al-Ta’rīk al-Kabīr, Damascus, 1349.  
Ta’rīkh Dimashq, Damascus, 1951-54.

Ibn A'tham al-Kūfī, Aḥmad b. Alī (d. 314/926).

Kitab al-Futūḥ, MS. Topkapı Sarayı (Aḥmet III)  
No. 2956.

Ibn al-Athīr, 'Izz 'l-Dīn 'Alī b. Muḥammad (d. 630/1233).

al-Kāmil fi 'l-Ta'rīkh,

al-Lubāb fī Tahdhīb al-Ansāb, Cairo, 1356.

Usd al-Ghāba fī Tamyīz al-Ṣaḥāba, Cairo, 1280.

Ibn Duraid, Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan (d. 321/933).

al-Ishtiqāq, Cairo, 1958.

Ibn al-Faqīh, Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Hamadānī (d. 365/975).

Kitāb al-Buldān, Leiden, 1885.

Ibn Hishām, 'Abd al-Malik (d. 141/758).

Sīrat al-Nabī, Cairo, 1937.

Ibn Ḥabīb, Muḥammad b. Ḥabīb (d. 245/859).

al-Muḥabbar, Hyderabad, 1942.

Mukhtahif al-Qabā'il wa Mu'talifiḥā,  
Gottingen, 1850.

Ibn Ḥawqal, 'Abū 'l-Qāsim al-Naṣībī (d. 367/979).

al-Masālik wa 'l-Mamālik, Leiden, 1872.

Ibn Ḥazm, Alī b. Aḥmad (d. 456/1064).

Jamharat Ansāb al-'Arab, Cairo, 1948.

Ibn al-Jawzī, Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'Alī (d. 597/1200).

Sīrat 'Omar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz, Cairo, 1331.

Ibn al-Kalbī, Hishām b. Muḥammad (d. 204/819).

Jamharat al-Nasab, MS. British Museum

(No. Add. 23,297).

al-Aṣṇām, Cairo, 1924.

Ibn Khaldūn, 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad (d. 808/1406).

Kitāb al-'Ibar, Bulāq, 1847.

al-Muqaddima, Beirut, 1961.

Ibn Khallikān, Aḥmad b. Muḥammad (d. 681/1281).

Wafayāt al-A'yān, Cairo, 1948.

Ibn Khurdādhba, Abū al-Qāsim 'Ubaid allāh b. 'Abdallāh  
(d. about 300/912).

al-Masālik wa 'l-Mamālik, Leiden, 1889.

Ibn Manẓur, Muḥammad b. Mukrram (d. 711/1311).

Lisān al-'Arab, Cairo, 1301.

Ibn al-Nadīm, Muḥammad b. Ishāq (d. 385/995).

al-Fihrist, Lipzic, 1871.

Ibn Qutaiba, Abū Muḥammad b. Muslim (d. 276/889).

al-Ma'ārif, Cairo, 1300.

al-Imāma wa 'l-Siyāsa, Cairo, n.d.

'Uyūn al-Akhbār, Cairo, 1963.

al-Shi'r wa'l Shu'arā', Cairo, 1944.

Ibn Rasūl, 'Omar b. Yusūf (d. 696/1296).

Trufat al-Aṣḥāb fī Ma'rifat al-Ansāb,  
Damascus, 1949.

Ibn Rustah, Aḥmad b. 'Omar (d. 310/922).

al-A'lāq al-Nafisa, Leiden, 1891.

Ibn Sa'd, Muḥammad (d. 230/845).

Kitāb al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā, Leiden, 1332.

Ibn Taghriberdī, Jāmāl 'l-Dīn Abū 'l-Mahāsin (874/1469).

al-Nujūm al-Zāhira fī Mulūk Misr wa 'l-Qāhira,  
Cairo, 192

- Al-Iṣfahānī, Abū 'l-Faraj, Alī b. al-Ḥusain (d. 356/969).  
Kitāb al-Aghānī, Cairo, 1284 and 1323.
- Iṣṭakharī, Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad (d. end of 4th/10th century).  
al-Masālik wa 'l-Mamālik, Leiden, 1870.
- Al-Jāhiz, Abū 'Uthmān 'Amr b. Baḥr (d. 255/868).  
al-Bayān wa 'l-Tabyīn, Cairo, 1948.  
al-Bukhalā', Beirut, 1960.  
Kitāb al-Tāj fī Akhlāq al-Mulūk, Cairo, 1914.
- Al-Jahshiyārī, Abū 'Abdallāh Muḥammad b. 'Abdūs (d. 331/942).  
al-Wuzarā' wa 'l-Kuttāb, Cairo, 1938.
- Al-Jawharī, Ismā'īl b. Ḥammad (d. 393/1002).  
al-Ṣiḥāḥ, Cairo, 1956.
- Al-Jumāhī, Muḥammad b. Sallām (d. 231/845).  
Tabaqāt Fuḥul al-Shu'arā', Cairo, 1952.
- Khalīfa b. Khayyāt, Abū 'Amr Khalīfa (240/854).  
Kitāb al-Ta'rīkh, Damascus, 1967.
- Al-Khawārizmī, Muḥammad b. Aḥmad (d. 387/997).  
Mafātīḥ al-'Ulūm, Cairo, 1930.
- Al-Kindī, Muḥammad b. Yūsuf (d. 350/961).  
Kitāb al-'Uyūn wa 'l-Ḥadā'iq fī Akhbār al-Ḥaqā'iq,  
 (anonymous), Leiden, 1853.
- Lughda, Abū Alī al-Hasan b. 'Abdallāh (3rd/10th century).  
Ṣifat Jazīrat al-'Arab, MS. al-Awqāf Library,  
 Baghdad.
- Al-Maqdisī, Muṭahar b. Tāhr (d. 322/934).  
Al-Bad' wa 'l-Ta'rīkh, Paris, 1899.



- Al-Maqdisī, Abū ‘Abdallāh Muḥammad (d. 287/997).  
Aḥsan al-Taḳāsīm fī Ma‘rifat al-Aqālīm,  
 Leiden, 1906.
- Al-Maqrīzī, Taqī al-Dīn Aḥmad b. ‘Alī (d. 845/1441).  
Imtā‘ al-Asmā‘ Dimā Lil Rasūl min al-Anbā’  
wa ‘l-Amwal wa ‘l-Hafada wa ‘l-Matā’,  
 Cairo, 1941.
- Al-Marzūqī, Abū Alī (d. 5th/11th century).  
al-Azmina wa ‘l-Amkina, Hederabad, 1332.
- Al-Mas‘ūdī, Abū al-Hasan ‘Alī b. al-Ḥusain (d. 345/956).  
Murūj al-Dhahab wa Ma‘dan al-Jawhar, Cairo, 1958.  
al-Tanbīh wa ‘l-Ishrāf, Cairo, 1938.
- Al-Māwardī, Alī b. Muḥammad (d. 450/1058).  
al-Aḥkām al-Ṣultāniya, Cairo, 1298.
- Al-Maydānī, Aḥmad b. Muḥammad (d. 518/1124).  
Majma‘ al-Amthāl, Cairo, 1352.
- Al-Minqarī, Naṣr b. Muzāḥim (d. 212/827).  
Wāqi‘at Ṣiffīn, Cairo, 1382.
- Al-Mubarrad, Muḥammad b. Yazīd (d. 285/898).  
al-Kāmil fī ‘l-Lagha, Cairo, 1956.  
Nasab ‘Adnān wa Qaḥṭān, Baghdad, 1950.
- Al-Marshakhi, Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Ja‘far (d. 348/957).  
Ta‘rīkh Bukhārā, tr. from Persian by  
 R.N. Frye, Cambridge, 1954.
- Al-Nuwayrī, Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad b. ‘Abdal-Wahāb (d. 732/1331).  
Nihāyat al-Arab fī Funūn al-Adab,  
 Cairo, 1929.

Qais b. al-Khaṭīm (d. 2/623).

Dīwān, Lipzic, 1914.

Al-Qalqashandī, Aḥmad b. 'Abdallāh (d. 821/1418).

Nihāyat al-Arab fī Ma'rifat Ansāb al-'Arab,  
Cairo, 1959.

Ṣubḥ al-A'shāfī Ṣina't al-Inshā, Cairo, 1913.

Al-Sadūsī, Mu'arrij b. 'Omar (d. 195/810).

Kitāb Ḥadhif min Nasab Quraish, Cairo, 1960.

Al-Sam'ānī, 'Abd al-Karīm b. Muḥammad (562/1167).

al-Ansāb, London, 1912.

Al-Ṭabarī, Abū Ja'far Muḥammad b. Jarrir (d. 310/923).

Ta'rīkh al-Rusul wa 'l-Mulūk, Cairo, 1323  
and 1963.

Al-Ṭabrīzī, Yaḥyā b. 'Alī (d. 502/1108).

Sharḥ Dīwān al-Ḥamāsa, Cairo, 1938.

Wakī', Muḥammad b. Khalaf (d. 300/918).

Akhbār al-Quḍāt, Cairo, 1927.

Al-Waqidī, Muḥammad b. 'Omar (d. 207/822).

Futūḥ al-Shām, Cairo, 1296.

Futūḥ al-'Irāq, MS., Leiden University  
Library (No. Or. 1399).

AO-Ya'qūbī, Aḥmad b. Abī Ya'qūb (d. 284/897).

Kitāb al-Ta'rīkh, Leiden, 1883 and  
Beirut, 1955.

Kitāb al-Buldān, Leiden, 1892.

Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī, (626/1229) Abū 'Abdallāh.

Mu'jam al-Bulḍān, Leipzig, 1866-1873.

Irshād al-Arif ilā Ma'rifat al-Adīb,

Cairo, 1924-30.

Al-Zabīdī, Abū 'l-Faiḍ Muḥammad Murtaḍa (1205/1701).

Tāj al-'Arūs, Cairo, 1306.

Al-Zubair b. Bakkār (d. 256/869).

Jamharat Nasab Quraish, Beirut, 1966.

Al-Zubairī, Muṣ'ab (d. 236/851).

Nasab Quraish, Cairo, 1953.

#### Modern Works

Bartold, W. Turkistān down to the Mongol invasion,  
London, 1968.

Bosworth, C.E. Sistān under the Arabs, Rome, 1968.

Brockelmann, C. Geschichte der Arabischen litteratur,  
2 Vols., Leiden, 1943-1949.

Supplement, 3 Vols., Leiden 1937-1942.

Bukhsh, S. Khudā. Ibn Khaldūn and his history of  
Islamic Civilization, Islamic Culture,  
Vol. 1, No. 4. Oct. 1927.

Caskel, W. Ġamharat an-Nasab das Genaelogische werk  
des Hišām Ibn Muḥammad al-Kalbī, Leiden, 1966.

Dennet, D.C. Marwān b. Muḥammad. Ph.D. thesis,  
Harvard, 1939.

Dūrī, ‘Abd al-‘Azīz,

Muqaddima fī Ta’rīkh Ṣadr al-Islām,

Beirūt, 1960.

Encyclopaedia of Islam. Leiden and London, 1913-1938.

New edn. Leiden and London, 1960.

Gibb, H.A.R., The Arab Conquest in Central Asia,

London, 1932.

Goldziher, I. Muhammedanische Studien, Halle, 1889.

Hasan, Naji, The revolution of Zaid b. Alī, Najaf, 1966.

Husain, Ṭāha, Fi ’l-Adab al-Jāhilī, Cairo, 1958.

Lammense, H. Etudes sur Le Siecle des Omayyades,

Beyrouth, 1930.

LeStrange, G. The Land of the Eastern Caliphate,

Cambridge, 1905 and Baghdad 1958.

Margolioth, D.S. Lecture on Arabic historian, Calcutta,

1930.

Muir, W. The Caliphate, its rise and decline, and fall,

London, 1876.

Petersen, E.E. Alī and Mu‘āwiya, Copenhāgin, 1964.

Puin, G.R. Der Diwān von ‘Umar Ibn al-Haṭṭāb, Bonn, 1970.

Rosenthāl, F. A history of Muslim Historiography,

Leiden, 1968.

Smith, R.W. Kinship and Marriage in Early Arab.

London, 1903.

al-Suwaidī, Abū ’l-Fawz Muḥammad Amīn,

Sabā’ik al-Dhahab fi Ma‘rifat Qaba’il al-Arab,

Cairo, n.d.

- Watt, W.M. Islamic Political Thought, Islamic Surveys,  
Edinburgh, 1968.
- Wellhausen, J. The Arab Kingdom and its fall,  
Calcutta, 1927. tr. by M.G. Weir.
- Wüstenfeld, F. Register zu den genealogischen Tabellen  
der Arabischen stämme und Familien,  
Göttingen, 1853.  
Genealogische Tabellen der Arabischen stämme  
und Familien, Göttingen, 1852.



QAH-TAN  
YAKUB  
YASH-TUB

